

T H E
SCOTCH LAW OF PATRONAGE


AND

THE RECENT SECESSION.

B Y

MACLEOD WYLIE, ESQ.

BARRISTER AT LAW.



C A L C U T T A :

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY J. A. GIBBONS,
ASIATIC PRESS, CREEK ROW, DHURHAMTOLLAH.
SOLD BY W. RUSHTON ; THACKER & Co. ; AND HAY, MEIK

1843.

THE SCOTCH LAW OF PATRONAGE

AND

THE RECENT SECESSION.



IMPORTANCE has lately been given to this subject, by events which must be deeply interesting to every Scotsman, and which probably are scarcely less interesting to others. It may therefore be convenient and agreeable to many in this country, to have an outline presented to them, of the controversy which resulted in the recent secession.

It is needful to premise, that there are two great distinctions, between the English and the Scotch ecclesiastical systems, which must be borne in mind in the consideration of this question. The first is, that no man in Scotland is *ordained*, before he is *inducted*. In England, there are very many cases of clergymen who having been ordained to curacies, and then ordained as priests, are left without a cure of souls. If such persons are presented to a living, the Bishop has merely to induct; not to ordain. He has not then an opportunity of considering the presentee's fitness for the ministry; it remains only, that he give effect to the ordination already conferred. The second distinction is, that there are no *benefices* in Scotland, as there are in England, where a clergyman is parson (that is

one office) and rector (that is another ;)—the ministers in Scotland are mere stipendiaries. In every case, the whole benefice is in lay hands, as I shall have occasion to mention hereafter ; and a salary, **varying** according to the regulations of the Court of Session sitting as the Teind Court, is paid by the heritors or landowners, to the minister. Thus, when a man who has been licensed in Scotland to preach, with view to make trial of his qualifications, is presented to a living, the Presbytery then, and not till then, have to consider of his ordination ; and ordination becomes part of the *res gesta* of induction. They ordain him minister of the parish ; and by the statute law, a certain stipendiary right then attaches to him. Under these peculiar circumstances it is complained, that when a Civil Court interferes in Scotland with the collation and admission of ministers, it interferes, not as it might do in England, with the strictly civil question of induction to a *benefice*, but with the purely spiritual function of *ordination*.

As I am not now addressing Scotsmen only, it may also be needful to make a few preliminary remarks, on the origin of Patronage. Before the reformation there were very nearly 1000 benefices ; for such, they were then. But all of these, except 262, became annexed by grant of patrons, to Abbacies and other religious institutions, which stood in place of the rector, and as such drew tithes. Such is Mr. Dunlop's statement of this part of the case, which has not at all been disputed. The patronage of these, was thus merged and extinguished ; and after the reformation, the Abbacies which had merged them, were erected into temporal Lordships, the grantees of which, came in the place of the former owners, for some time drew the tithes, and had to provide for the cures. But this they

seldom heeded ; or when they did attend to this duty, they paid merely a stipend to the persons whom they might occasionally appoint or employ.

In this view of the case, Lord Stair, the highest authority in Scottish law, says, with reference to these churches, that “there was no patronages of all these Kirks”—a proposition which seems to be true ; for, when King James, afterwards, in granting these great Lordships, included also the right of presenting to the annexed churches, great agitation arose ; and the practice was prohibited by Parliament (1592. c. 121.) The statement on this statute, even of Sir George Mackenzie, the high prerogative lawyer of King Charles the Second’s persecuting days, commonly called “Bloody Mackenzie,” is as follows :—

“It was usual to mortify * formal and established patronages of the Kirk, which were formally erected into parsonages, and to these the monks presented parsons, and were only in place of patrons. At other times teinds were mortified and given to them ; and after the Reformation, *though teinds were declared the patrimony of the Church*, by the act of annexation, yet thereafter the Lords of Erection did prevail by their importunities with the King, to erect these teinds into rectories and parsonages, whereof the patronage was given to the Lord of erection. *But there can be nothing so unjust and illegal as these patronages were*, and therefore this Act of Parliament finding the abuse was growing, did declare that all erections of Kirk lands and teinds in temporal lordships and livings, to the prejudice of the Kirk, and hurt of His Majesty’s estate and privilege of his crown, were null, &c. &c.”

Notwithstanding this statute, however, and not-

* Concede, or grant.

withstanding constant struggles, which, as having a more fitting place in history, I cannot notice, private patronage, grew. But when the Kirk was settled at the Revolution, patronage was abolished. By the act of abolition (1690. c. 23.) 600 merks were directed to be paid to each patron in satisfaction of his patronage, and the patrons, further, received the benefice, in lieu of the patronage, on condition of paying the ministers a stipend. The Treaty of union therefore, found patronage extinct; and it was made a fundamental article, that the rights and settlement of the Kirk, should be preserved without alteration to the people, in all succeeding generations. In 1711, however, in the reign of Queen Anne, an act was passed restoring patronage; yet, at the same time, leaving, the chief compensation for the loss of it, namely the Parochial teinds, in the hands of the Patrons. In few cases the 600 merks had been paid. Where it was paid, it was provided, that there should be formal renunciation of Patronage for ever, and in those few cases Patronage therefore, was not restored to the original Patrons*. It

* It is important to note that the clause about the payment of "600 merks" did not appear in the original draft of the bill. This is stated by Wodrow, who had it directly from Sir James Stewart of Goodtrees, the Lord Advocate at the time, and who himself drew it up. The clause was inserted, on the first reading of the act in Parliament, at the suggestion of Sir William Hamilton, afterwards Lord Whitelaw, who said "that he liked the draft well enough, but would have somewhat added, for," said he, "what this Parliament abolishes another Parliament may establish," and therefore he proposed that a bar might be put on any restoration in time to come. This ulterior purpose, it was agreed, could only be secured "in the way of renunciation, for an equivalent determined by Parliament, and the Patrons obliged to take that." Accordingly, the immediate operation, of the act, in respect of the abolition of patronage was not suspended till payment of the 600 merks. It came into play immediately, and the only reasons why in so few instances, this small sum was paid, to obtain the renunciation, were "partly that the people enjoyed the privilege already, and partly that the patrons, with whom the power of enforcing payment was vested, did not enforce it."

was on this statute of Queen Anne, that the greater part of the late controversy hinged.

It is not necessary for a strict legal determination on the case, but it is highly important for a correct understanding of the principles and character of the recent secession in Scotland, that some account should be added, of the purpose and character of this Bill. And as my object is two fold, to state the law, and to illustrate the whole question, I subjoin some remarks on this subject. Lord President Dundas, who had been one of the Commissioners of the Union, in speaking in 1736, of the measure, said, "notwithstanding the security of this our happy establishment in all its parts, was as great and solemn as it was possible for human laws and constitutions to devise or execute, yet in prejudice of that security, as we apprehend, the act in the 10th of Queen Anne was passed, restoring to Patrons the power of presenting, and suffering them at the same time, to retain the valuable equivalent which they received, by the 23rd act, 1690, and this Act, 10th Anne, it is well known, was imposed upon this Church, by means of persons of our own country, who were enemies to the Protestant succession, and enemies to this Church, by reason of her inviolable adherence to that succession, and was by them intended to afflict and oppress this Church, and to create discontents among the people therein, and to open a door for Patrons arbitrarily to impose upon the people as ministers, persons proper for instilling into their minds principles of disloyalty and disaffection to the present happy constitution." A slight knowledge of the designs and principles of the Bolingbroke party will justify these assertions. The celebrated Dr. Francis Hutcheson, Professor of Moral Philosophy in Edinburgh, whose remarkable

works gave the chief impetus to the study of mental philosophy in Scotland, where it afterwards so greatly flourished under Reid, Dugald Stewart, Brown, &c., spoke thus in a pamphlet on the same subject :—" It is submitted to all impartial men, whether that act in 1711, was not the most direct breach of the most solemn public faith in the articles of Union, and whether it can be very glorious in the ministers or friends of a Protestant Prince of the Hanover line, to retain that claim, so oppressive to the Church of Scotland, which was introduced by the enemies of that illustrious family, on purpose to distress and raise dissensions in the Church of Scotland, because of her steady adherence to the succession, when it was in great danger." And Sir Walter Scott, than whom no one ever better knew the history or the traditions of his country, said, that "*the restoration of the rights of lay Patrons in Queen Anne's time, was designed to separate the Ministers of the Kirk from the people, and to render them more dependent on the nobility and gentry, amongst whom, much more than the common people, the sentiments of Jacobitism prevailed.*" To these remarks might be added many quotations from his novel, the Heart of Mid Lothian, in which, though much and ungenerously caricatured, may be seen (in many of the conversations of David Deans,) a representation of the feelings of the people of Scotland on the subject, as they were, and as they are. To a full comprehension of the question it is needful also to know; that the great secession which began in Scotland in 1739, was commenced on this very ground; and that it has grown in the course of the century, by the unceasing resistance of the people to patronage, to no less than 500 congregations, and scarcely less than a third of the population. Against the act of

Queen Anne the General Assembly protested at the time; and continued to petition and protest for very nearly seventy years afterwards *.

With respect to Crown Patronage, it is to be observed, that this had its origin chiefly, in the Crown's seizure of the patronage of the Bishops. But of what nature that patronage itself was, after the reformation, and during the troublous times when Bishops were reestablished in Scotland, may be gathered from Archbishop Leighton's distinct acknowledgment, of the right of the people to consent to the appointment of the minister, presented by the patron.

I now turn to the more strict and technical discussion which the question has raised.

* I may here make a few remarks on the extent of former secessions, and of the late one; with a view to shew the importance of this question of Patronage, which occasioned them.

Prior to the late secession there was already, as I have stated in the text, about a third of the population ranged against the establishment. In several counties the proportion of Dissenters to Churchmen, real and nominal, was even greater. Thus the last statistical account of Selkirkshire, showed that the population there, was divided into 688 Church Establishment families, and 455 Dissenting families; and the case was not much better in the counties of Roxburgh, Wigton, and Peebles. In some counties there was little dissent, as in Rosshire; but there, the recent secession has been almost universal. On the whole I apprehend, that now, not nearly one tenth of the population can be calculated on, as adhering even in name, to the establishment, Nor is this minority possessed of a superior amount of property, or degree of intelligence. The land of the country is chiefly in the hands of Episcopalians; of the Presbyterian landlords, Lord Breadalbane is the principal, and he has seceded, and with him many of the chief of the rest of the landowners who were connected with the Church. In the ranks of the different secessions there are also the principal authors of the country, particularly Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Keith, Dr. Dick, Sir David Brewster and Dr. Forbes, Mr. McCrie, Dr. Abercrombie, Dr. Duncan, with Dr. Welsh, Dr. Black and others of the most distinguished men in the country. To these must be added several of the leaders of the bar; at least one, and he perhaps the most profound, of the Judges; and though last not least, nearly the whole periodical press.

Of the Scottish members of Parliament, few who are not Episcopalians, are connected with the established Church. I rather think that Mr. Hope Johnstone is the only Presbyterian in Parliament, who adheres to it.

The Reformed religion in Scotland arose up against the Government, and not, as in England, under Henry the VIII., Edward the VI., and Queen Elizabeth, under royal care. Ministers without state provision, and oftentimes without state protection, went preaching among the people, and grew in popularity and strength, till they were enabled to settle down quietly in particular places, and so were found in possession of the parishes, not of the benefices, when the Parliament of Scotland recognized them. The Parliamentary Convention met in 1560; by that Convention, Popery was declared to be abolished, and Knox and others having given in their confession of faith, that confession was "ratified and approved as hailsome and sound doctrine, grounded upon the infallible word of God." And in that confession the independence and freedom of the Church's jurisdiction in her own concerns, was declared. More than this, that Parliament did not do. It neither sanctioned, regulated, or created any further ecclesiastical system whatever, in the country. It left the country, in fact, without an established Church; and the Kirk, whose confession they had acknowledged, was left to make its own way among the people, and to exercise its own discipline, in all respects as a separate or dissenting church now does. The Church of Scotland therefore, in its origin, was no state creation.

On the other hand, when the authority of the Pope was thrown off in England, the act which was passed to give legal effect to the King's determination, ran thus (26 Henry VIII. c. 1.) "The King's Majesty, justly and rightfully is, and ought to be the supreme head of the Church in England, and so is recognized by the clergy of this realm in their convocation." And in conformity to this principle, large ecclesiastical powers were given to the Monarch, and they were

exercised, even in the alteration of *doctrines*, as well as in patronage and the exercise of discipline.

On the 20th December, 1560, the first General Assembly met. On this point let us hear Lord Moncrieff (Stewarton case) "By what authority? Manifestly by the *sole* authority of the Church itself. There was no previous act of the state to authorize it. Yet it was held openly, never complained of as illegal—but, on the contrary, expressly recognized, as a lawful institution both in itself and in its positive acts, in the very first Parliament, which after seven years took farther cognizance of the subject. * * * * *

Fifteen General Assemblies were successively convened and held, before there was the least notice either of such an Institution, or of any system for the Government of the Church in any act of Parliament. In all those various assemblies, the most important acts both of judgment and of legislation were exercised by the body so assembled; and though all was done openly and in public, there was no complaint, and no surmise that these Assemblies used usurping powers, which did not belong to them."

One of the principal acts of these Assemblies was the provision of a book of Church Government, which under the name of the First Book of Discipline has ever since been a standard of the Church. In this book (Chapter iv. section 2.) it is declared, that "*It appertaineth to the people and to every several congregation, to elect their own minister.*"

Thus stood the case when the Parliament of 1567 assembled. The fourth act of that Parliament was to ratify anew, the Confession of the Faith;—a confession, which, while it declared the Lord Jesus Christ to be sole head of the Church, (Chapter 25. Sec. 6.) and yet acknowledged that "it is the duty of the people to

pray for magistrates and to honor their persons, to pay them tribute and other dues, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority for conscience sake," "from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted." (Chapter 26. sec. 4.) did also declare the existence of a Church government deriving title from the head of the Church and not at all from the civil magistrate, and did state the offices of that government to be, among other things, the admission of office bearers to the Church (Chapter 30.) with which and its other offices, it likewise declared, that "the civil magistrate may not meddle." (Chapter 23. sec. 3.) The parliament in 1567, I repeat, acknowledged and ratified this confession.

By the 6th act of that parliament it was recited, that there was a ministry in the land "whom, God of his mercie has now rasit up amangst us," and that people adhere to them, and that they held the doctrines of the Confession of Faith ; and therefore it was declared, that "Our Soverane Lord the King, with the advice of my Lord Regent, and the three estates of this present Parliament, has *declarit*, and *declariss* the *foresaid* Kirk to be the only true and holy Kirk of Jesus Christ within this realme." Here again, besides calling attention to the difference between this adoption of the Scotch Kirk, and the establishment of the English one, we must quote Lord Moncrieff: "Here is no creation or erection of any thing—but there is an *adoption* and *recognition* of the existing Church, and a declaration that she is the *only* true Church of the realm." The Church took not her doctrines from the State, but being organized, the state recognized her as the only true Church in the country at that time. The next act of that Parliament (the seventh) is "about the admission of them that shall be presented to *bene-*

fices, having care of ministry." Here it must be noticed, that the benefices had been granted or were then supposed to be held by the Clergy, and the induction into *them*, clearly was and ever must be, a matter of civil cognizance; and next it is clear that patronage was then in some sense, existing. This act provides "that the *examination* and *admission* of ministers within this realm be only in the power of the Kirk now openly and publicly professed within the same;" it then provides that the patron shall present within a given period from the vacancy of a benefice, and there is a provision for a case of dispute with regard to the admission of a presentee. An appeal is first given "to the superintendent and ministers of that province, where the benefice lies," and then "to the General Assembly of this hail realm, be whom the cause being decyded, *shall take end as they decern and declare.*"

With the year 1567, sunshine with the Church of Scotland, ended. History speaks to the fact of how lawless a nobility, how rude a people, how tyrannical a king then existed. Persecution soon arose; banishments, imprisonments, confiscations, and death. The King declared his own ecclesiastical supremacy, and the clergy resisted it. Knox and Melvil against Arran and the favorites, struggled long, and suffered severely. Nevertheless, the Kirk held her ground, and amidst all the struggles framed and published her second Book of Discipline, which was agreed upon in 1578, inserted in the Register of Assembly in 1581, sworn to in national covenant in 1638, and has ever been the chief standard of discipline in the Church. That book, on the subject of ordination of ministers, declares (Chapter 3. sec. 5.) that "*it is to be eschewit, that na person be intrusit in any of the offices of the Kirk, contrar to the will of the congregation to whom they*

are appointed, or without the voice of the eldership."

It is difficult to ascertain what was the exact *practice* of the Church in those troublous times, for few records are left of them; but some hints may be collected. In their instructions to Presbyteries in 1576, the General Assembly ordered that "the consent of the flock should be obtained, or else a reasonable cause be shown, wherefore not." And an ancient authority on Church matters, Colville the historian, says, in speaking of the second Book of Discipline, "according to the second Book of Discipline, the election should be given to the Presbytery with power to the major part of the people to dissent on reasons assigned, to be judged of by the Presbytery." This is not in fact, strictly accordant with the second book of discipline, but it is a testimony to the practice of the time. Then again after Presbyterianism was more firmly established, King James asked the question "Is not the consent of the greater part of the flock in the parish necessary to elect a pastor?" The question was considered by the Synod of Fife, and the General Assembly reported, "The majority of the flock shall give their consent, or else a sufficient reason of their refusal."

It is said that these several cases are evidences chiefly, of the supremacy of the Presbytery over the people. They at least exclude the idea of the Civil Courts interfering in the matter at that time. There is indeed no hint of any such interference in early days. The whole records of the past, go to show this: that the consent of the people was an important element in the consideration of the fitness of a man for a charge; while, at the same time, the Presbytery reserved the check of considering whether there was

reason or not, in the refusal to consent. That was the practice so far as it can be ascertained, of troublous times ; times when the strict application of the principle of popular consent, was impossible everywhere, because Popery was only partially suppressed, and the people though remarkably advanced in some parts of the country, were marauders in some counties of the south, and were mere vassals in the north. The *principle* of a popular consent evidently had been expressly acknowledged in the Church's standards, in the first and second book of discipline, which were then, as they are now, in force, and the *final* decision in every case, was by statute, left to the General Assembly; without appeal;—“ *it shall take end, as they shall decern and declare.*”

I come now to the period, when the storm, was for a time, allayed, and when the King and Parliament once more became professedly friendly to the Kirk—the year 1592, in which the statute (c. 8.) was passed, of which we will take Lord Moncrieff's accurate and distinct account. “ I read again,” says that able judge, “ the act 1592, c. 8.; whereby, the whole system of the Church Courts in General Assemblies, Presbyteries, Kirk Sessions, and provincial assemblies and Synods was ratified and approved, subject to the qualifications therein expressed, that the Legislature thereby “ decerns, and declares, that the said Assemblies, Presbyteries, and Sessions, the *jurisdiction* and *discipline* thereof foresaid, to be all times coming most just, good, and godly in the self,” notwithstanding whatever statutes might be to the contrary, and that all “ acts, laws, and statutes made at any time before the day and date hereof, against the liberty of the true Kirk, *jurisdiction*, and *discipline* thereof as the saman is used and exercised in this realm are

repealed; and after repealing certain special statutes, and declaring that they shall naeways be prejudicial, nor derogate anything to the privilege that God has given the spiritual office bearers in the Kirk, concerning heads of religion, matters of heresy, excommunication, *collation and deprivation of ministers* or ony sic essential censures special grounded, or having warrant on the Word of God," it ordains presentations to benefices to be directed to the Presbyteries, "with full power to them to give collations thereupon:" and then I read these words added "and *to put order to all matters and causes ecclesiastical* within their bounds, according to the discipline of the Kirk." When Charles the Second endeavoured to destroy the Presbyterianism which he had sworn to protect, and commenced that flagrant persecution, in which, as was most truly said by his brother, he, an actual Papist, and believing the Episcopalians and Presbyterians equally to be heretics, was compelling the Scottish people to choose between two ways, each of them equally leading to condemnation—when that heartless Monarch repealed the statute of 1592, how did he and his council understand it? They determined (1662. c. 1.) to "Rescind, cass, and annul all acts of Parliament, *by which the sole and only power and jurisdiction* within this Church doth stand in the Church, and in the General provincial, and Presbyterian Assemblies and Kirk Sessions, &c. &c. &c."

The act of 1592 was law, till this last mentioned statute passed in 1662: and in that seventy years, it is most distinctly clear from the writings of the chief Divines of the time, Henderson, Rutherford, Gillespie, &c., that the principles, which were enumerated in the first and second Books of Discipline, and the confession of Faith, which had been ratified, were held, if

possible, with more earnestness than ever. It was indeed, the popular element which the Presbyterians infused into their Church Government, that made it so odious to James the 1st. and his son; and which caused Charles the Second to declare that it was "not a religion for a gentleman." It is quite true that during those seventy years, and afterwards, even up to the day of the Revolution settlement, there was much difficulty in applying the principle of popular consent in many parts of the country, in an orderly way. But this is certain: that under the almost incessant persecution of the Presbyterians, there was no case of the Civil Court, forcing or intruding a *Presbyterian* minister on any parish, though indeed Episcopalians were settled by force of arms, almost every where; and further,—that in the trials and difficulties of those days, every Presbyterian minister *must have been a popular one*,—if not chosen by the people, at least ministering by their consent. It is impossible to conceive a contrary case in such times. I have mentioned one of Sir Walter Scott's Novels; let me now name another, *Old Mortality*, and ask any man who will seriously consider the subject, to say, if in the days there described, there was any room for an unpopular or an *intruded* Presbyterian clergy.

The next statute I have to notice, is that of 1690. c. 5.—part of the Revolution settlement, which established, ratified and confirmed the confession of Faith*, and the Presbyterian Church *Government*, and *Discipline* as ratified and established in 1592. In the same year another act (c. 23.) was passed, to which I have alluded in an early part of this paper, abolishing patronage altogether, on the terms, and giving the

* This was the famous Westminster confession, which embodies precisely the same doctrines as the more ancient confession.

compensation I have before mentioned. The provision made by this statute for the appointment of ministers was as follows:—

“ And to the effect, the calling and entering ministers, in all time coming may be orderly and regularly performed, their Majesties, with consent of the estates of Parliament, do statute and declare, that in case of the vacancy of any particular church, and for supplying the same with a minister, the heritors of the said Parish (being Protestants) and the elders, *are to name and propose the person to the whole congregation* to be approved or disapproved by them; and if they disapprove, that the disapprovers give in their reasons, to the effect the affair *may be cognosced upon by the Presbytery of the bounds*, at whose judgment, and by whose determination, (not, it will be observed, by that of the Civil Court) the calling and entering of a particular minister *is to be ordered and concluded*.”

Such was the state of the law, when the Union was proposed. What was the conduct of the Scottish people at that time? Before they would treat of the question, they passed an act (Act 1705. c. 4.) which provides, “that the said Commissioners shall *not treat of or concerning* any alteration of the worship, *discipline*, and government of the Church of this kingdom, *as now by law established*.” In the following year they passed the act of security (Act 1706. c. 6.) which ratifies the act 1690. c. 5, and the Confession of Faith, and provides and declares “that the foresaid Presbyterian Church *Government and discipline*, that is to say the Government of the Church, by Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies, all established by the foresaid acts of Parliament pursuant to the claim of right, shall remain and continue *unalterable*.” And this act, it says, “shall be

held and observed in all time coming as a fundamental and essential condition of any treaty of union to be concluded betwixt the two kingdoms, without any alteration thereof, or derogation thereto, in any sort for ever."

In the act of Union accordingly, (5th Anne, c. 8.) this act of security is inserted at length; and it is further provided, that an act for securing the Church of England, and this act of the Parliament of Scotland for securing the Protestant religion, and "the Presbyterian Church Government with the establishment in the said act contained, be, and shall for ever be, held and to be observed *as Fundamental and essential conditions* of the said Union, *and shall in all time coming* be taken to be, and are hereby declared to be, *essential and fundamental parts of the said articles and union.*"

Now, up to this point I apprehend that it must be clear, that a consent on the part of the people to the pastoral relation was a fundamental principle of the Church; that the supreme and final authority in all ecclesiastical matters was given to the Church; and that the *discipline* of the Church, of which a consentient ordination was part, was recognized and approved by statute. We have neither heard nor read, anywhere, of any case, in which the Civil Courts up to this time, had ventured to consider, alter, or check, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Church. Such cases there were in England; but the supremacy of the King which had been formally acknowledged in England, had been as formally repudiated in Scotland; and the whole character of the Scottish Church forbids the application to it, of the rules which are applicable to England. There were two very different sorts of reformation in the two countries; two distinct

systems of ecclesiastical polity ; and two distinct kinds of struggles with the state.

In 1711, only five years and a half after the union, the famous act 10 Anne, c. 12, was passed, restoring patronage, and yet leaving, as I have before had occasion to state, the compensation for the loss of it, in the hands of the patrons. The words of that statute, on which the late controversy has chiefly turned, are as follows : “ from and after the first day of May one thousand seven hundred and twelve, it shall and may be lawful for her Majesty, her heirs and successors, and for every other person or persons who have right to any patronage or patronages of any Church or Churches whatsoever in that part of Great Britain called Scotland, (and who have not made a formal renunciation thereof under their hands) to *present a qualified minister or ministers to any Church or Churches* whereof they are patrons, which shall after the said first day of May, happen to be vacant ; and the Presbytery of the respective bounds shall and is hereby obliged, to receive and admit in the same, such *qualified person or persons*, minister or ministers, as shall be presented by the respective patrons, *as the person or ministers presented before the making of this act ought to have been admitted.*”

On the character and history of this statute, I have already cited some comments. To these, I might add, the pamphlet of Sir David Dalrymple, (Solicitor-General and one of the Commissioners of the union), whose opinion of its being in violation of the act of union, was also declared. But it is more important to have regard to the practice under it, both of the Courts Spiritual and the Civil Court. Lord Brougham dismisses this part of the subject by saying little more, than that for many years after 1711 the

rights of the patrons were but sparingly enforced. It would have been a much more fair and true representation of the matter, to say, that till the Lethendy, Trinity, and Auchterarder cases in 1837, 8 and 9, there was no legal precedent whatever, for the Civil Court to enforce the right of the patrons in the manner which they endeavoured to do, in those and subsequent cases. On account of *a veto from the parish*, the patron's presentee to Aberdeen, was *rejected* in 1726; and in the case of Alves in 1728; in the case of Old Machar in 1729; that of Kinnaird in 1736; that of Currie in 1740; that of Biggar in 1752; those of Glendovar and St. Ninians in 1768,—in all of these cases, *presentees were rejected on the same, the very same ground as formed the basis of the proceedings of the Presbytery in Auchterarder and the other cases, which have of late been so much discussed.* In none of these did the Civil Court interfere; while, in the first case of Auchmuchty in 1735, in those of Culross in 1751, Lanark in 1752, and Forbes in 1762, wherein Presbyteries went much further, and did enter into the bounds of the civil jurisdiction by *preferring one presentation to another*, i. e. deciding, the strictly civil question, who was the legal patron, *the Civil Court refused any redress, but that which is specially provided by a statute which I shall have hereafter to notice*—namely that of *empowering the patron to retain the stipend.* And in the case of Culross, particularly, wherein the patron applied for the interference of the Civil Court to check a wrongful settlement, then in progress, the petition was unanimously “refused as incompetent;” and in that of Dunse, in 1749, wherein one of the objects of the patron's petition was, that the Presbytery should “be discharged to moderate a call at large, or to settle another man,” the Lords,

says Lord Monboddo, “ would not meddle, because that was interfering with the power of ordination, or the internal policy of the Kirk, with which the Lords thought that they had nothing to do.” (5 Brown’s supplement, 768.) The principle of this conduct on the part of the Court of Session, may be gathered from their decision in the case of Robertson and Preston in 1780, Mor. 7572, in which an action having been brought for defamation in judicial proceedings in the Church Courts, it was held, that “ the defenders, being an ecclesiastical Court, were not subordinate to any civil one.” And this principle is still further elucidated by a very celebrated judge Lord Kames, who in one of his tracts on Courts, speaks thus :

“ Ecclesiastical Courts, besides their censorial power with relation to manners and religion, have an important *jurisdiction* in providing parishes with proper ministers or pastors, and they exercise this jurisdiction by naming for the minister of a vacant church, that person duly qualified who is presented by the patron. *Their sentence is ultimate even when their proceedings are illegal.* The person authorized by their sentence, *even in opposition to the presentee*, is de facto minister of the parish ; and as such is entitled to perform every ministerial function. One would imagine that this should entitle him to the benefice or stipend, for a person vested in any office, is of course entitled to emoluments. And yet the Court of Session, without pretending to deprive a minister of his office, *will bar him from the stipend*, if the ecclesiastical Court has proceeded illegally in the settlement. Such interposition of the Court of Session, singular in appearance, is, however, founded in law, and is also necessary in good policy. With respect to the former, *there is no necessary connexion betwixt being minis-*

ter of a parish, and being entitled to a stipend ; witness the pastors of the primitive church, who were maintained by voluntary contributions. It belongs indeed to the Ecclesiastical Court to provide a parish with a minister; but it belongs to the Civil Court to judge whether that minister be entitled to a stipend; and the Court of Session will find, that a minister wrongously settled, has no claim to a stipend. With respect to the latter, it would be a great defect in the constitution of a Government, that Ecclesiastical Courts should have an arbitrary power, in providing parishes with ministers. To prevent such arbitrary power, the check provided by law is, that a minister settled illegally shall not be entitled to a stipend. This happily reconciles two things commonly opposite. The check is extremely mild, and yet is fully effectual to prevent abuse."

I am not aware of the exact date of the publication of this tract, but apprehend that it was about 1770; and *as there is nothing to be found to the contrary in Scotch law books*, and as the only precedents confirm this view, I may take it for granted, this was the general understanding of the law in Scotland, up to the time when the late controversy arose.

Let us now see what was the practical working of the system. Up to 1768 it is proved by the precedents I have referred to, that Presbyteries did, without the interference of the Civil Courts, and notwithstanding the statute of Anne, reject presentees when obnoxious to the people. Not long after 1768, however, a great change occurred in the policy of the Church of Scotland. Into this matter, in respect of the *religious* distinctions between Moderates and Evangelicals, it is not my purpose or my province now to enter. It is enough to observe this: that one

party was distinguished from the other, as well by great practical religious differences, *as by its opposition to public opinion*. The Church of Scotland for about fifty years, was under the sway of Dr. Robertson the historian, Dr. Blair, Dr. Hamilton and others, who were not only distinguished from their opponents by their indifference to missions, public education, and the calvinistic doctrines of their fathers; but also, and not in a less degree, by their steady resistance to the popular will in all things. From the time when Lord North's administration derived so much aid from Mr. Wedderburn (himself a Scotchman), afterwards Lord Chancellor Loughborough; and from Mr. Dundas, afterwards Lord Melville, it is notorious, that a very large portion of the stream of Government patronage flowed into Scotland; and it is impossible for any who has read the trials of Muir and others, during the excitement produced by the French revolution, to doubt, that both judges and counsel had been affected by this flood of Government favor, and lost their independence, and became enemies both of justice and of freedom. The conduct of some of the judges was not unworthy of Jeffries; and if this were so as regard the Courts of Justice, it was scarcely less so in the government's party in the General Assembly. Instead of heeding a popular objection to a presentee, the General Assembly, if *they approved* of him, (and Dr. Robertson in a letter which is extant, had told the Government by what sort of men alone, he could "support patronage")—would order him to be settled, by force. In many cases troops were called out—so steadfast and so violent was the resistance of the people; and "riding commissions," as they were called, were appointed, to superintend the oppression. The result in nearly every case, was, the erection of a secession chapel,—

for the Dissenters in Scotland, without any considerable exceptions, seceded from the Church *on this ground only, and never differed, and do not now differ with her, on any doctrine.* In those days, there was therefore, no doubt, a general temporary deprivation of the right of veto, by the people. But this was never the act of the whole church; it was a struggle and a wrong throughout; and if instead of seceding, the ministers of those times, whose circumstances were so different to the circumstance of the ministers of these times, had staid in, and persevered in resisting it, the system would soon have been abolished; because, *they* unlike Dr. Chalmers and the recent seceders, were resisting only a majority in the Church itself, which had been suddenly secured and was gradually losing ground, *and were not resisting the civil Courts*, who never interfered in those days in the matter. Indeed I may here remark, that perhaps there never was a time when the Civil Courts, unsatisfactory as they then were, were less disposed to interfere with the Church. The state found that the Church was then a convenient political tool, and that she was disposed to help and not to thwart; and therefore it could afford to show all outward respect, and recognize all her power, which was then in fact, only exercised in the Government's favor.

Under these circumstances, were the rights of the Church lost? How so? The standards of the Church, her Government and discipline, as regulated by those standards, had been ratified by act of Parliament, and never were altered by the Church, however much they were for a time neglected. But more than this: it is necessary to notice, that the Church, even under this blighting regime, so far from disallowing the rights of the people, in truth

did confirm them. A "*call*" had always, it seems, been necessary from a parish to a presentee; nor would a Presbytery induct any man who had not a call. It is true that these calls in bad times, were merely formal, and were not required to be signed by a majority or even by many of the people. Yet a call was in those times, still held to be necessary; and this, of itself, being an immemorial custom, appears to me highly significant of the ancient practice of the Church. Even in the height of the Moderate ascendancy, when a complaint was made, that the Presbytery of Stirling had settled a man without a call, the General Assembly highly censured them. This, very strangely, is taken by Lord Brougham as an argument in favour of his decision; as showing that a call was not *necessary*. He argues that if it were, the settlement ought to have been set aside. This does not follow;—a man once ordained is not easily unordained; nor is he to be deposed for a mere error in form on the part of the Presbytery. But the fact of the leaders of Assembly in such days, still insisting on a call, shows that they still acknowledged the old principle of non-intrusion; and that they nevertheless practically infringed it too often, proves only, that those were days of much party spirit, and that those leaders were warm party men.

I must here notice also, that Lord Brougham in his judgment, appears (I say it with all respect for his most eminent abilities) to have claimed the right of defending the Moderates, as one of their party. When the veto act of 1834 was passed, he, as Lord Chancellor, highly approved of it; and spoke of it and of the noble lord who proposed it, with the highest commendation. But in his judgment, he called on himself to remember, that he was a relative (collaterally) of Dr.

Robertson; he styled him "a wise statesman;" he lauded his policy; and in a style, far more fitted for his successor as leader of a party, than for a judge of the first judicial tribunal in the land, he declaimed against those, by whom the church was released from the "moderate" ascendancy; and he has ever since pursued the subject with all his constitutional energy, as though it were a matter of personal honor and interest. It is remarkable that his own maternal grandfather to whom he also referred, was a minister forcibly settled in his parish by a riding commission and a troop of soldiery, and that, not without a serious riot, followed, I believe, by bloodshed. Nor is it less remarkable, that Lord Brougham's coadjutor, in his warm attacks on the popular rights in Scotland—Lord Campbell—is the son of one of the same party of oppressive "moderates," whom it is Lord Brougham's pride to represent.

I have alluded thus to the ascendancy of the moderate party, because it was necessary to do so, in order to convey a just conception of the steadiness, with which the right of popular consent was defended by the people, even in the worst times. I will not enter at length into the history of the decline and fall of that party; how they were gradually weakened and subdued. It is enough to say that under Dr. Erskine, Mr. Walker, Dr. Andrew Thompson*, Dr. Chalmers, the late Sir Henry Moncreiff and other able men, the Evangelical party, as it was called,

* Dr. Thompson was indeed one of the ablest men of modern times in Scotland, and exercised a most powerful influence throughout the country. It was he who gave the plain and striking answer to the Moderate, who ridiculed the idea of giving patronage to the people, who might be "a set of brutes." "Well," said the Doctor, "and will it mend the matter to give it to *one* of the brutes, and he perhaps the greatest brute of all?"

gained strength. It is enough to know, that in 1834 they had for the first time for fifty years or perhaps more, a majority in the General Assembly. Their first step was to meet the question of patronage. The agitation on it was then very great; several of the chief men in Scotland were leaders of the Anti-Patronage Society, and dissent was rapidly gaining ground from the continued operation of the popular abhorrence of the system. The plan adopted by the General Assembly to meet the emergency, is now indeed held up to indignation, as a most flagrant act of presumption; but at the time, it was not only intended as a compromise between two extremes, but was in fact so. The Solicitor General, and the law officers of the Church were consulted, and it was resolved to propose an act in the General Assembly, which should provide for the right of the people at a certain stage of the proceedings after a presentation, to declare their objection if they entertained any to any particular presentee, being settled as their minister. This "act anent calls" commonly called the veto act, was accordingly proposed by Lord Moncrieff in the General Assembly, and carried. It limited the right of objection to male heads of families being communicants. Not only did the Lord Chancellor of that time, as I have said, hail the measure as a most fair and wise settlement of a difficult question; but the Government, which held the greater part of the patronage in Scotland, resolved to act under it; most of the principal patrons did the same; and so far from it being discovered, that the Church had committed something little short of treason, almost the first thing Sir Robert Peel's administration did, on its accession to office, was, to propose a grant of money for church extension in Scotland. It is not denied, that the new system

worked most admirably in nearly every case ; it restored harmony to the Church, it was the means of providing the Church with some of the best ministers that ever entered it, and it was felt to be no grievance by the patrons, who generally adopted the plan of presenting what was called a leet, or a list of three or four, and left it to the parish to select one.

However, this did not last long. The cases of Lethendy, and Trinity-Gask, and Auchterarder within a very few years re-opened the whole question. I do not enter into the first two, which are named, as they were almost contemporaneous with the more important one of Auchterarder ; because also they were not prosecuted to an appeal, and finally settled by law. Nor is it at all needful to enter into the subsequent cases of Cusamond and Marnock, which were decided on the authority of the judgment in the Auchterarder case as confirmed in the House of Lords. The Auchterarder case was that, in which the principles of both parties were most discussed and best developed, and in which alone, the House of Lords was called upon for a decision.

The facts of that case were as follows : The Reverend Robert Young, a probationer of the Church (that is one who had been licensed to preach on trials, previously to his ordination), was in October, 1834, presented by the Earl of Kinnoul, to the parish of Auchterarder in Perthshire. The Presbytery then resolved that they must proceed to “fill up the vacancy according to the said act and regulations,”—i. e., the veto act and its provisions. At this meeting of the Presbytery, Lord Kinnoul’s agent was present. The Presbytery then fixed a day for “moderating in a call,” and in the mean time directed Mr. Young to preach twice to the congregation. In all this the patron’s agent acquiesced. On

the day fixed by the Presbytery, after these sermons, they proceeded to take "the call" from the parish. This was in the usual and ancient form, and I beg particular attention to it, because I think that *such* forms of calls, can in no other way be explained, than as having their foundation in the ancient principle, of popular consent. Nor can the continuance of the practice of requiring a call from the parish, as well as a presentation from the patron, fail to prove that this principle, was always recognized.

"We the Heritors, Elders, heads of families, and parishioners of the parish of Auchterarder, being satisfied with the learning, abilities, and other good qualifications of you Mr. Robert Young, preacher of the gospel, and having heard you preach to our satisfaction and edification, do hereby invite and call you the said Mr. Robert Young, to take charge and oversight of this parish, and to come and labor among us in the work of the gospel ministry, hereby promising to you due respect and encouragement in the Lord. We likewise entreat the Reverend Presbytery of Auchterarder to approve and concur with this our most cordial call, and to use all proper means for making the same effectual, by your ordination and settlement among us, as soon as the steps necessary thereto will admit." Report, vol. 1. Appendix, page 36.

In 1831 the census of Auchterarder showed a population of 3,182 inhabitants; this call was signed by three persons only,—the patron's agent, "Michael Tod," and "Peter Clerk." The Presbytery then gave the parishioners, being male heads of families and communicants, an opportunity to express their dissent, and a veto signed by 287 heads of families out of the 330 heads of families on the roll, was given in. To this roll the presentee objected, as not having been made

up in the time or in the mode prescribed by the regulations ; but he stated no other objection. The Presbytery rejected his protest against the roll ; he then appealed to the Synod, and then to the General Assembly ; but the Presbytery's decision was upheld, and he was then rejected. On this, he appealed to the Synod, on other grounds, concluding with a prayer that the Presbytery "should now proceed in the manner required by the 9th and 13th sections of the act of 1834,"—i. e., the veto act. He, however, abandoned this appeal, and then with Lord Kinnoul "raised his action" in the Court of Session. In this action he sought nothing beyond a recognition of his presentation, and the fruits of the benefice ; but soon after the cause was in Court, the pursuers obtained leave to amend their summons, and they then went further, prayed for a declaration that the Presbytery were bound and astricted to take him on his trials, and *for a command for them to do so*. It is not the least remarkable part of this case and the whole proceedings, that the Court would not issue that order. Throughout the whole controversy there was indeed an astonishing want of judgment, in this and similar proceedings of the Court of Session. They issued interdicts and scarcely ever enforced them ; they declared what Presbyteries ought to do, and asserted their right to bid them obey, and yet refused, for a very long time, to issue that injunction.

The Court of Session at the time of the decision was divided ; the majority supporting the summons with the exception we have mentioned. Throughout, however, the ablest judges were on the side of the Church. I allude to Lord Glenlee (since retired), a man most remarkable for his experience, and the vigor of his ripened intellect, who is said at the age of

four score, to have still found his relaxation from law, in mathematics ; Lord Moncrieff, Lord Jeffrey, Lord Cockburn, Lord Fullerton, and Lord Ivory. From the Court of Session the case was taken to the House of Lords, and there, the decision of the majority of the Scotch judges was confirmed, by Lords Brougham and Cottenham.

It may appear at first sight, presumptuous to differ from these eminent men ; but when it is considered that it is a question of Scotch law, and that the most celebrated Scotch judges are opposed to the views of these noble and learned Lords ; that Lord Brougham manifested an *animus* that shakes confidence in his judgment ; and that Lord Cottenham an English lawyer, and certainly a profound and distinguished man, was yet without that habit of mind which seems essential to the due appreciation of Scottish ecclesiastical questions ; when further it is considered, that a mere English lawyer, accustomed to recognize the supremacy of the King in ecclesiastical affairs, is eminently unsuited to the full investigation of such a case as this ; the charge of presumption, will not have much weight, or if it have, the burden may be easily borne, when so many must share it. It will not do, to assume that those are necessarily wrong who differ from great judges, unless those judges themselves are first proved to be infallible.

Let us then examine their decision. It may be safely said to rest chiefly upon a clause in the statute of 1592, c. 116 ; whereby Presbyteries were astricted to admit all *qualified ministers* presented to them by the lawful patrons. In so far as it is supported by the statute of Anne, we will also examine it hereafter.

Now I have no wish to evade the force of the words ; they are precise ; yet to my apprehension

they appear to afford no foundation whatever, for the decision.

In the first place, let it be remembered that the statute of 1592, c. 116, was passed after a most severe period of persecution, in which many Presbyterian ministers had been exiled, and imprisoned. The clause may have referred to them. If one of those men, who really were "qualified ministers," (having been duly ordained), was presented to a parish, the Presbytery were bound to admit him, subject to the other regulations of the Church which had been sanctioned by other acts of Parliament. It is difficult to decide how "qualified minister" can be held to apply to Mr. Young, who was no minister at all; and who never could be a minister, without that ordination which the Presbytery expressly denied him.

But again; this very statute, of 1592. c. 116, leaves the whole power of collation of ministers in the hands of the Church; ordering all presentations to be direct to the particular Presbyteries in all time coming "with *full power* to give collation thereupon, and to put ordour to all matters ecclesiasticall within their bounds."

And was this statute of 1592. c. 116, the only one on the statute book? What says the legal charter of the Church; the statute that in fact established her—the statute of 1567, which I have before quoted. Why, it provides for the case of a Presbytery not doing its duty; and does it order the Court of Session to interfere? Not so, it provides expressly, for an appeal to the General Assembly, "*by whom the matter being decyded, sall take end, as they decern and declare.*" And in the act of the same Parliament "anent the jurisdiction public appertaining to the true Kirk and immaculate spouse of Jesus Christ," it is declared

that "there be no other jurisdiction ecclesiasticall acknowledged within this realm, uther than that quilk is and sall be within the same Kirk."

And were there no subsequent statutes? Yes the very next act in the statute book, is that of 1592. c. 117, which provides another remedy for the Presbytery's refusal to ordain a qualified minister; namely that it shall be lawful for the patron "*to retain the whole fruits of the benefice in his own hands.*" That this was understood to be the *only* remedy in Lord Kames's times, I have already shewn. Where then was the right of the Courts of Law to insist on Mr. Young's ordination?—where was their authority, to interfere, not only with the civil question of the stipendiary right, but also with *the spiritual function of ordination?*

But once more. In 1662, Charles the second, succeeded in passing an act (c. 2.) declaring his supremacy, and utterly repealing every act that sanctioned Presbyterianism. This act "casses and annuls all acts of Parliament by which the sole and only power and jurisdiction within this Church, doth stand in the Church, and the General, Provincial and Presbyterial Assemblies, and Kirk Sessions, and all acts of Parliament or Council which may be interpreted to give any Church power, jurisdiction, or Government to the office bearers of the Church at their respective meetings, other than that which acknowledgeth a dependence upon and subordination to the Sovereign power of the King as supreme, and which is to be regulated and authorized *by the Archbishops and Bishops* who are to put order to all ecclesiastical matters and causes, and to be accountable to his Majesty for their administration." At one fell swoop this statute, in fact, swept away all the rights of the Presbyterians

and all their duties, as such; “and particularly” it abolished the act 1592. c. 116. And this tyrannical measure based on the king’s perjury, and backed by nought, but a savage soldiery and the tortures and despotism of the Duke of Lauderdale and his myrmidons, was the law of the law, when the Revolution settlement was made. By the act 1690, c. 1, this former statute was *repealed*. By a subsequent statute 1690. c. 5, the act 1592 c. 116, was renewed and revived, EXCEPT THAT PART OF IT RELATING TO PATRONAGE; (a point which it is essential to remember); and it further ratifies the Confession of Faith of the Westminister (Presbyterian) Assembly, which had been adopted by the Kirk, and which denies kingly supremacy by expressly asserting the independence of the Kirk.

In this way all the rights of the Church were intended to be restored and were restored; because the act of 1592. c. 116, so revived recognized and chartered them. Under that act, and the acts which that statute recognized, the government and the *discipline* of the Church had been legally established. It was part of that discipline, (in the two books of discipline), that there should be no forced pastoral relationship; and it was part of those former acts, that an appeal from a Presbytery should *take end* in the General Assembly, to which body, was allowed sole and exclusive ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Patronage being excluded from this act of 1690 c. 5, what became of it? It was abolished. I have before adverted to that fact; and therefore need now only allude to the substitute, which by this statute, (Wm. and Mary c. 23. 1690 Scots Parliament) was provided; “*in case of the vacancy of any particular Church for the supplying the same with a minister, the heritors of the said parish being Protestants, and*

the Elders, are to name and propose the person to the whole congregation to be either approved or disapproved by them, and if they disapprove, that the disapprovers given in their reasons to the effect the affair may be cognosced upon by the Presbytery of the bounds, at whose judgment, and by whose determination, the calling and entering of a particular minister is to be ordered and concluded."

Thus stood the law when the statute of Anne passed, and that, after restoring patronage, provided as I have already noticed that on a vacancy the patron was to "*present a qualified person or minister*" and "*the Presbytery of the respective bounds shall and is hereby obliged to receive and admit in the same manner, such qualified person as shall be presented by the respective patrons and as the persons or ministers presented before the making of this act, ought to have been admitted.*" (sec. 1.)

Now what was the law showing who "ought to have been admitted" before the passing of that act? Was it, as it is contended, the statute 1592. c. 116, so far as that act referred to patronages? No it was so far, *repealed*; and never had been restored.

Then what was the law to be observed? *Surely the law under the Anti-patronage act of 1690 which I have quoted; and which provided for the consent of the people; which was the only unrepealed law on the subject.* The only difference that was made, was, that the patrons, and not the heritors and elders, were to present.

And what meant qualified minister, and "qualified person?" Not what the court of law pleased, but what the Presbytery resolved, for, full power in the collation of ministers, was, as I have shown, as much theirs, by statute, as it was by divine authority; and

if they resolved ILLEGALLY ; the remedy was *the withholding of the stipend, under 1592. c. 117.*

But the patron was to *present* a “qualified person ; *that*, had reference to an act prior to the Presbytery commencing their examination. What then was to hinder the General Assembly regulating, that all persons should be deemed unqualified, who were obnoxious, and who therefore must have been unprofitable to the people ? To the church had been accorded by law, the full powers in the collation of ministers, which she herself claimed *jure divino*, and ~~which~~, in fact exercised before her connection with the state.

And even if the Presbytery of Auchterarder had done wrong ; was the appeal to the court of law ? No, but to the General Assembly, by statute, by whom “the cause being decyded, *shall take end*, as THEY discern and declare.”

But I will not further enlarge on these points. It is painful to see judges deciding as they have done, in this case. If any one will carefully read the judgments of the majority, he will find this to be their general tenor, “a Church establishment is the creature of the state, and must obey in all things which the state commands ;—if not, there is an imperium in imperio.” Well, and what then ? Do Courts of Law interfere with Dissenting congregations or Roman Catholic bishops ? Is not each of these an imperium in imperio. Disestablish the Church to-morrow, and you do not make her less an imperium in imperio ; and why ? because her powers of ordination were hers, before she became connected with the state, and continue to be hers when that connection ceases ;—if after *that*, they are still interfered with, then comes another part of the struggle, which has been going on in many countries for centuries, which has sent martyrs

to the stake, and heroes to the scaffold, which never yet did issue, and never yet will issue, in ought, save the shame and discomfiture of the oppressors. As to the theory of a Church Establishment being the creature of the state, it is true in fact, that its property may be the state's; its Churches may be the state's, but its spiritual powers are its own.

On the whole case of Auchterarder, I will conclude by saying, that I cannot, and do not doubt, that the decision of posterity will be against the judges, who decided that case against the Church. In the most favorable view of it, it can only be said, that a statute *passed in violation of the act of union*, effected the purpose for which the Bolingbroke Administration designed it, namely the severance of the people of Scotland from the establishment.

Finally, I will add a few and but a few words, on two or three more points connected with this subject. First as to the recent secession. It did not occur in consequence of the Auchterarder case only. That case was followed up, by a series of interdicts, and decisions, so extraordinary, that at last it was declared by one of the judges, that there was not one spiritual function, with which the Civil Courts had not interfered. The decision in the Auchterarder case paved the way, as all such decisions ever must and will do, for more and more invasions, till at length every one of the parts of the Church's jurisdiction, ~~were~~ incroached upon, or usurped.

Secondly, as to the present state of the law under Lord Aberdeen's bill. That measure gives to the people a right to state objections, but it gives the presbytery the power to decide on those objections; and if *they* do not agree with them, the presentee is to be inducted, notwithstanding the want of popular

consent. This is in fact nothing but Dr. Robertson's regime restored; it contradicts the fundamental laws of the Church in the two books of discipline; it nullifies the practice of the Church as it existed, *even after the statute of Anne down to 1768*, in the cases which I have mentioned; it makes the call a farce; it gives arbitrary power to that body of the clergy, who in former times proved their inclination to abuse it, and who now are entirely stripped of sympathy with or from the people*. True it is, that ancient regulations recognized the right of Presbyteries to consider vetoes; but this, in troublous times, was necessary; and it must be remembered that their

* I subjoin two protest against this measure, which embody many of the principal objections that were urged to it, in Parliament :

Lord Breadalbane's Protest against the Church of Scotland Benefices bill.

Dissentient,

First,—Because this Act interferes with the concerns of the Church in a way that is inconsistent with its spiritual independence, it being unconstitutional for the Legislature to make any alteration in the government and discipline of the Church, or to prescribe the forms of the procedure of its courts, without the co-operation and sanction of the Church itself.

Second,—Because it is a fundamental principle of the Church of Scotland, that no minister be intruded on a parish contrary to the will of the congregation; whereas by the present Bill this principle is wholly set aside, and another, viz., that no minister be appointed to a parish contrary to the will of the Presbytery and other Church courts, is established in its place, thus subverting an essential article of the Presbyterian Church.

Third,—Because by this Act both the Crown and lay patronage will be substantially transferred into the hands of the Presbyteries of the Church, thus creating an ecclesiastical domination subversive of the principles of civil liberty, and wholly repugnant to the principles of the Presbyterian Church.

(Signed) **BREADALBANE.**

Lord Cottenham's Protest Against the Third Reading of the Scotch Church Benefices Bill.

Dissentient,

First,—Because the Bill, so far as it professes to be declaratory, declares to be law that which is not now the law of Scotland.

superintendence, was always subject to the fundamental principle, that “na person should be intrusit on ony office of the Kirk contra to the will of the congregation.” There is a vast practical difference between a law which gives the power to consider objections, subject to this principle, and a law which drops this principle altogether, and leaves to unpopular Presbyteries, arbitrary power. Priestly authority is checked in England by the civil power; and in Scotland it was restrained by the people; when it has been unchecked, on the one hand or the other, in these, or any countries, evil and oppression have followed.

Lastly, this measure of Lord Aberdeens was offered to the non intrusion party, and rejected. They refused the power it thurst on them;—they preferred the public rights to the extension of their own authority. And yet, they are held up to opprobrium, as grasping ecclesiastics, seeking the gratification of their ambition! They contended for just and for ancient principles, and I have no hesitation in declaring my conscientious belief, that ~~as~~ they were, and that hereafter they will be owned as the advocates of freedom, and not less as the defenders of the constitution and the laws of their Church, and of their country. They did not secede till an absolute necessity arose. Some of the chief proceedings of the Civil Courts had at length come to a final decree, and they had to choose be-

Second,—Because the Bill, so far as it professes to be enactive, contains provisions which confer undue powers upon the Church courts, and are derogatory to the existing rights of patrons.

(Signed,)

COTTENHAM.

CAMPBELL.

ZETLAND (for the second reason.)

LYTTELTON (for the first reason.)

LANGDALE.

MONTEAGLE OF BANDON.

BREADALBANE.

DUNCANNON.

tween forcing obnoxious ministers on Auchterarder Marnock and Cusalmund, or leaving the Church: Had they consented to intrude those presentees no result would have been attained, because already were other parishes protesting against other presentees, and the people generally, were resolved to resist the settlement of unacceptable men. Their task of intrusion therefore, would have only then begun, instead of then ending. Moreover, they had deposed some ministers; the Civil Courts refused to recognize the deposition, and a large body, the "moderate" party in the Church, continued to cooperate with the deposed ministers, and to treat them as still entitled to exercise their functions. The Church must have either consented to this remarkable, and very extensive schism, or have proceeded to depose, the many ministers and elders who defied her. Hence must have come still more difficulties. Above all, Lord Aberdeen's bill, as it was shadowed forth to the seceders in the communications of Government, while it refused the non intrusion principle, was also deficient in other important points. It afforded no sort of protection against all those other invasions of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which had lately been carried to so extraordinary a length, by the Courts of Law. The crisis therefore had come; and the seceders retired. They might have remained in their parishes, but the people would then have seceded without them;—they might have remained; no physical necessity compelled them to retire, but they must have first consented to the surrender of principles for which in many a year of trial and suffering, their fathers had struggled, for which not a few of their fathers had died. They must have consented to the loss of rights which they themselves had declared to be

essential; and finally they must have prepared for the perpetual suspicion, if not for the contempt of the people, for the total loss of their own good fame and influence, and for the eventual overthrow, with the general consent of Christendom, of their betrayed and enslaved establishment.

BRIEF STATEMENT

RELATIVE TO THE

OBJECTS AND OPERATIONS

OF THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S INSTITUTION,

CORNWALLIS SQUARE, CALCUTTA.

WITH

APPENDICES.

CALCUTTA :

PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, CIRCULAR ROAD,

1841.

Extract of the Minutes of the Corresponding Board in connection with the Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

“ At a meeting of the Corresponding Board of the Mission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland held this day, the following Brief Statement regarding the General Assembly's Institution was laid before the Board by the Assembly's Missionaries, and, having been read, was approved of, and ordered to be printed and circulated.”

JAMES CHARLES,

Secretary to the Corresponding Board.

Calcutta. April 7. 1841.

BRIEF STATEMENT,

&c.

I.—IMMEDIATE OBJECTS OF THE INSTITUTION— SUBJECTS OF STUDY, &c.

THE Institution, which constitutes a leading branch of the general Missionary scheme of the Church of Scotland, was organised in August, 1830. From the first, it was designed to consist of *two* departments:—the one, *preparatory*; the other, of a *higher* or *collegiate* order. The object of the *former* is, to initiate the boys into the elements of Grammar, History, Chronology, Geography, Arithmetic, and Geometry, in inseparable conjunction with the principles of the Christian faith. The object of the *latter* is, to perfect an acquaintance with the branches previously acquired; and to embrace, more or less extensively as growing circumstances may admit, the various higher departments of literature, science, and Christian theology,—together with Church History, Systematic Divinity, and the sacred languages of the Old and New Testaments. In such a course

of instruction, the pupils are habitually regarded and treated, as possessed of *two* natures—the mortal and the immortal;—the one, connecting them with *time* and its *sensible* objects; the other, linking them with *eternity* and its *invisible* realities. *Time*, as the first stage of the journey of an undying spirit, temporarily confined within a mortal tenement, is to be provided for. We are the sincere friends of the temporal amelioration of our fellow-subjects in India; therefore, are lessons freely and largely imparted in all needful branches of temporal knowledge. *Eternity*, the second and immeasurably the most momentous stage in the onward career of an immortal spirit, after it is uncoiled from the trammels of mortality, is to be provided for. We desire above all things to promote the everlasting welfare of our Indian fellow-subjects; therefore, are lessons freely and largely imparted from the Bible and approved works in every branch of sacred knowledge—and especially in the evidences, doctrines and precepts of the Christian faith. It is this intimate blending of what has been termed a sound secular instruction with a sound moral and religious instruction, throughout every department, which constitutes the distinguishing feature of the course of education pursued. This is a combination, the necessity of which God himself, in the very framework of our twofold being, hath clearly established;—a combination, which man can

never, without violence to his own nature and destiny as well as to the dictates of God's holy oracles, attempt to divorce or tear asunder. It is a combination, therefore, on which we insist as absolutely essential towards entitling any educational course to the honorable appellation of *complete, liberal, and catholic*; because, by simultaneously developing *all* the faculties of an immortal spirit, in due and fitting proportion, provision and equipment are made for the transitory passage through *time*, in such way as to form a discipline and preparation for the coming awards of *eternity*.

II.—MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION.

While it is confessed that the vernacular languages alone are available for imparting an *elementary* education to the *mass* of the people of Hindustán, it is held to be an undoubted *fact*, that these languages do not, *at present*, afford either an adequate medium or adequate materials for communicating a knowledge of the *more advanced* departments of literature, science, and theology. Such a medium is supplied in perfection, by the English language. Much attention is accordingly bestowed on the cultivation of this language; which, when once acquired, becomes the grand medium of instruction in the *higher*

branches of learning. Such being the paramount importance of English, viewed as a vehicle for transferring the higher literature, science, and theology of Christendom into the national mind of India, it seems a matter for adoring gratitude, that, in the good Providence of God, there has arisen such an extreme anxiety among a large and influential portion of the natives to acquire a knowledge of it—that native youths generally discover a remarkable aptitude for the acquisition—and that, in consequence, numbers have already mastered the language so as to converse in it with considerable fluency. Equally essential is it to the intellectual, moral, and religious emancipation of the millions of India, that the vernacular languages should be duly cultivated, enriched, and improved. It has, accordingly, been the systematic endeavour of the conductors of the Assembly's Institution, *from its very commencement*, to encourage, in different ways, the careful study of the vernacular dialects. Long *before* the study of the vernaculars was stimulated by the Regulations of Government, or patronized by a fostering public, it was insisted on as part of the regular course, that the pupils of every class should devote, *at least one hour each day*, under a separate master, to the perfecting of their knowledge of the mother-tongue. The difficulties encountered in this important department of the general system, from the want

of qualified masters and suitable books, have hitherto proved of a peculiarly intractable character ; but unremitted efforts are still making, not without encouraging symptoms of success, to render it increasingly efficient. Thus, according to the uniform and consistent course hitherto pursued, the English language is regarded as the great channel of *acquisition* to the *thoroughly educated few*; while the vernacular dialects become the channels of *distribution* to the *ordinarily educated many*—the former unsealing the *fountain* of all knowledge, and the latter serving as *ducts* to diffuse its vivifying and healing waters over the wastes of a dry and parched land.

III.—CONTEMPLATED BENEFITS.

1. By being put in possession of the English language, the entire circle of European literature and science will at once be thrown open to Hindu youths; and numbers will become qualified to read the Christian Scriptures in our admirable English version, peruse treatises on Christian evidence, and expositions of Christian doctrine directly, in the words of the original authors. This surely is no ordinary blessing. This is not to impart knowledge by measure—to bestow it with niggardly hand—to dole it out of our treasury by scraps and fragments, in versions or

translations, accurate or inaccurate. No;—this is at once to present numbers with the key of knowledge—of *all* knowledge, literary, scientific and sacred;—knowledge, which ages of time and hosts of translators could scarcely furnish—knowledge, which, in quantity and quality, the works written in all other languages, living or dead, of the world besides, could not collectively supply.

2. As the Hindus possess stupendous systems of learning on all subjects—geographies, astronomies, metaphysics, &c., as well as marvellous cosmogonies and theogonies—all abounding with the grossest imaginable errors and yet all claiming the same divine origin and asserting the same title to infallibility—it follows, that the inculcation and apprehension of any branch of useful knowledge must tend to shake their confidence in the truth of their own systems generally; and that, if branch after branch be communicated, one stone after another will be thrown down from the huge fabric of Hinduism; so that, at length, when an extensive course of education is completed, the whole will be found to have crumbled into fragments. Hence it is that, along with the demolition of false systems of literature and science, the Assembly's Institution, from the varied instruction it imparts, must inevitably tend to cause the downfall of *Pantheism*, with its blasphemous delusions; of *Idolatry*, with its numberless enormities,—and, simultaneously with the overthrow of

both, the abolition of caste, which, for ages, has exercised the most mischievous and grinding tyranny over the whole mass of the native population.

3. But,—as it is certainly not *good*, simply to destroy, and then leave men idly to gaze over the ruins ; nor *wise*, to continue building on the walls of a tottering edifice,—it will ever form the grand and distinguishing glory of the Institution, through the introduction and zealous pursuit of the study of Christian evidence and doctrine, to strive to supply the noblest substitute in place of that which has been demolished, in the form of sound general knowledge and pure evangelical truth. Nor will such blessings be confined to the immediate recipients alone. Through these, the blessings gained, must ultimately extend and multiply. Should any be admitted, professing Christianity, every principle will be strengthened and every branch of knowledge cultivated and matured. Should the majority enter, avowing themselves to be still the votaries of idolatry, many must become Christians in *understanding* ; and there is the same probability that springs from Christian instruction at home, that a fair proportion may become Christians in *heart*. Now, of ~~either~~, or all of these classes, let one and another be added in continued succession, and the collective mind will at length be freely set loose from its ancient fixed and frozen state, and awakened into light,

and life, and liberty. And as life is self-propagating, and light communicative in its nature, we may thus happily succeed in combining the three inestimable blessings—*individual good, the ever renovating principle of self-preservation, and the power of indefinite extension.*

4. By the process now pointed out, it will be our increasing and prayerful effort to endeavour, through God's blessing, to raise up a body of *native agents*; from whom, even in the secular offices and relations of life, may emanate such healthful influences, as must produce the happiest impressions on the surrounding mass. More especially may we succeed in rearing a well disciplined body of *Christian teachers* who shall diffuse the blessings of a wholesome education throughout the land. And over and above all, in real importance, may we be honoured, through the accompanying efficacy of omnipotent grace, in qualifying a noble band of *Christian ministers*,—who,—from being habituated to the climate, from their acquaintance with the vernacular languages, from their knowledge of the manners, customs, feelings, sentiments, and prejudices of the people,—may well be expected to labour in proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation through a crucified Redeemer, from shore to shore, with a power and efficiency which it were vain for the majority of foreign labourers to expect to attain.

IV.—PRACTICAL MANAGEMENT, &c.

The Institution being established and supported by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, with that Venerable body rests the supreme control over it. This control is exercised through the medium of a standing Executive Committee, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Brunton, Convener; the Rev. Doctors Dickson, Chalmers, Gordon, Ritchie, and Muir; and the Rev. Messrs. Grant, Paul, Hunter, and Bruce. The direct or immediate management of it is vested in the Assembly's accredited Missionaries, who are regularly ordained clergymen of the Scottish National Church. At present these are, the Rev. Dr. Duff, and the Rev. Messrs. McKay, Ewart, Macdonald, and Smith. The pecuniary and other secular affairs of the mission are conducted by a Corresponding Board consisting of the Missionaries and other gentlemen appointed by the Foreign Missionary Committee of the General Assembly. At present, the non-missionary members of the Board consist of D. McFarlan, Esq. Chairman; Rev. J. Charles, D. D. Secretary; the Rev. Mr. Meiklejohn, J. F. M. Reid, Esq., J. Grant, Esq., C. Dearie, Esq. Treasurer.

The mode of instruction adopted from the beginning has been what is termed the interrogatory or intellectual, in opposition to the old dull mecha-

nical system. The teaching of the junior classes is conducted chiefly by the *more advanced students* in the higher or collegiate department ; who are thus gradually initiated into the principles and practice of the most improved modes of tuition ; while scope is afforded for their latent sympathies being awakened, the kindlings of generosity excited, and all the previously accumulated stores of knowledge augmented and enhanced by the reiterated act of largely imparting to others what they have freely received themselves. As an additional means of sharpening the attention, strengthening the memory, increasing the facility of expression, and establishing the habit of forming clear and definite ideas, the pupils of the higher classes are constantly made to interrogate each other, in orderly succession, on any of the subjects of previous study. For the sake also of conducting the process of elliptico-interrogative examination on a more comprehensive scale, imprinting truths more deeply on the understanding and the heart by the sympathetic touch of simultaneous response, and securing more impressively the great ends of moral training and discipline, a gallery has been erected in one of the side rooms, capable of holding between two hundred and fifty and three hundred. But no mere description can convey an adequate representation of the varied modes and details of an improved system of tuition ;—to be at all distinctly understood, they must be wit-

nessed in actual operation. To the Institution there is attached a library of several thousand volumes ; and an extensive philosophical apparatus which has been provided from *special* funds contributed by the friends of native Christian Education in Scotland.

V.—SUCCESS ALREADY ATTAINED.

In attracting a greater number of native youths than any Seminary in Calcutta, and in communicating to them a sound general and religious knowledge, the Institution has, on all hands, been allowed to be pre-eminently successful. The number of pupils, actually connected with it, is *between eight and nine hundred*—of different castes, including the very highest; and of different ages, from six to twenty and upwards. The kind and amount of knowledge imparted will best appear from the *programme* of the last annual examination, which will be found appended to this brief statement*. The great proficiency of the pupils, or the superior mastery which they have acquired of all the branches taught, has been repeatedly attested, in the strongest terms, by successive visitors of every rank and condition in life. Their appearance at the last public examination has been greatly eu-

* Appendix A.

logized by all the leading metropolitan journals, European and Native. From these, a few quotations will be found in Appendix B. To the reader another criterion may still be furnished which amounts to a species of *visible* exhibition. The prize of a valuable Gold medal has been established and endowed by D. McFarlan, Esq. to be annually awarded to the *best general scholar* in the Institution. The method adopted for deciding the point at the commencement of the present year, was the following.—

From the multiplicity of subjects which had occupied the attention of the higher classes a selection was made. On each of these a series of questions, greater or less, was framed and committed to writing by one or other of the Assembly's Missionaries. The first week in January being fixed on for the examination, the competitors were, on *successive* days, shut up for several hours in the Lecture-room of the Institution. There, the questions on the subject or subjects for each day, were, for the first time, read out in their hearing, and by them distinctly copied. Unprovided with any apparatus whatsoever, *except pen, ink, and blank paper*, they were required *within a limited and specified period*, to write down extemporaneously as many answers as they could. On one or more of the subjects proposed the answers of most of the candidates were not only highly creditable, but admirable. These, however,

given in by Mahendra Lál Basák, were, on a *full AVERAGE comparison of the whole*, adjudged to be the best. These will be found in Appendix C, precisely as they came from the young man himself, *without the slightest alteration, either in the style or substance,—without so much even as a single grammatical correction*. The publication of answers, written out *so hurriedly in a foreign tongue*, without the aid of Grammar or Dictionary, or the advantage of subsequent amendment from the suggestion of others, must, it is obvious, subject the native author to the severest imaginable test. There is scarcely any of the answers, which the writer might not have given in a more complete and comprehensive form, had there been fewer questions proposed within the *limited time*; or, without abridging the number of questions, had the time been extended to *double the length fixed on*. Still, such as they are, it has been deemed best, to publish them in their *unaltered* state, as the fairest possible specimen of the nature of the studies in the Institution, and as affording the most satisfactory evidence of the proficiency attained by the more advanced classes in these studies.

As a further method of exercising the minds and testing the attainments of the pupils, essays on diverse subjects are from time to time proposed. A few extracts from the best essay on one of these subjects will be found in Appendix D.

The statements now given, with the document-

any evidence in the Appendices, must satisfy every reasonable mind that, in so far as regards the cultivation of the mental faculties of hundreds of native youth as well as the communication, in a digested form, of a wide range of sound general knowledge and evangelical truth, the Assembly's Institution has eminently accomplished one great end of its founders. From its walls, numbers have already gone forth, who, from their cultured intellects and improved tone of moral feeling, must constitute so many *nuclei* of influence and coming change in those various spheres of life which their superior education has fitted them to occupy. Not a few have found employment, as well disciplined teachers, in Government and other seminaries; and also, as Tutors in private families, both European and Native. Of the *heart-felt reality* of the *religious convictions and impressions* of the greater part it becomes us to speak with becoming diffidence and reserve. Several, who have left or are still in the Institution, have, at times, manifested the deepest anxiety and earnestness on the subject of salvation. Some, who appeared to have been really born again, and, as such, were candidates for admission into the Christian church by baptism, have again been found to relapse into sluggish indifference. Others, without any obtrusive profession, seem not far from the kingdom of heaven. Hundreds have far more *head faith and head knowledge* than

may have been possessed by thousands of saints and martyrs now in glory. *We cannot give the heart belief and saving impression.* This is the peculiar and inalienable prerogative of the Omnipotent Spirit of all grace, who alone can take of the things of Christ, and *savingly* shew them to penitent Sinners. It is our part to persevere in the use of the appointed means—to plant and to water—ever looking up to God our heavenly Father for the blessed increase. Suppose then, we had not been favored with a single case of real conversion, we should still be satisfied that, in communicating the knowledge of salvation to hundreds, we were walking in the prescribed path of duty. But, blessed be God, though we have not yet to report of thousands, as on the day of Pentecost, we have not been left without special tokens and signatures of His favor and grace. In immediate connection with our mission and institution, individuals have been led openly to renounce their idols, openly to embrace the Lord Jesus Christ as their God and Saviour—and that too, under circumstances so appalling to flesh and blood as triumphantly to vindicate their sincerity. Of these some have been confined, chained and cruelly beaten; they have been compelled to relinquish father and mother, and all endearments of home; they have gladly submitted to the alternative of being prepared to undergo the loss of all things, and even death itself, rather than abandon the cause

and cross of Christ. The first of these converts has long since been called to his rest. Another has for years been labouring with stedfast perseverance as an ordained minister, though in communion with the Church of England. A third has toiled indefatigably and successfully as a teacher and catechist in the Western Provinces, and latterly in connection with the mission of the Presbyterian Church of America. A fourth, after a long visit and sojourn in England, has of late been appointed to proclaim the gospel to his countrymen, as an agent of the London Missionary Society. At this moment, after several years' probation, have *three solemnly resolved to dedicate their lives to the arduous but momentous office of the Christian ministry.* They are, accordingly, engaged in a course of *special studies*, designed to qualify them for the appointment of superiorly educated catechists, and ultimately for that of ordained ministers of the everlasting gospel.

With such memorials of past success and such promises of prospective blessing to the benighted heathen around us, we commit the cause of our Institution to the prayers and the liberalities of all the real friends of India. The Church of Scotland has hitherto nobly supported us. At Bombay and Madras also, she has similar Institutions to uphold, while the claims on her bounty, at home and abroad, have of late multiplied more than ten-fold. We would therefore earnestly soli-

cit the believing prayers and the pecuniary contributions of all our fellow-subjects in this land, who have experimentally learnt that it is "more blessed to give than to receive."

Signed in his own name and that
of his Colleagues,

ALEXANDER DUFF.

*Cornwallis Square, Calcutta,
March, 1841.*

APPENDIX.

A.

Programme of the Tenth Annual Examination of the pupils attending the General Assembly's Institution.

ON account of the advanced studies of the higher classes, the Institution, in the month of May last, was divided into two great departments—the one, preparatory, the other, Collegiate. The studies in the latter department are so arranged as to occupy in regular succession, a period of *at least four years*. Agreeably to this arrangement the *first year's* class in the college department is the *lowest*.

During the past year, care has, as usual, been taken to correct the class-registers, *monthly*, so as to exhibit, as nearly as possible, the number of *bond fide* pupils. The number of names *at present* in the registers, after all have been struck out for whose absence a satisfactory reason has not been assigned, is, in the School Department, 821; and in the College Department, 49. From sickness and other causes of fluctuation, the number in *actual daily attendance* will always be about a *fifth* less than that exhibited by the registers.

COLLEGE DEPARTMENT.

FIRST YEAR'S CLASS —22 STUDENTS.

BRANCHES OF STUDY.

Bible,—first four books of Moses, four Gospels and Acts.
Horne's Manual of the Evidences of Christianity—whole.
Poetical Instructor, 224 pp.—History of England—whole.
Political Economy (Clift's), 162 pp.—English Composition.

Arithmetic.—Algebra, Simple Equations.
 Geometry, first six books of Euclid. Plane Trigonometry.
 Lardner's Pneumatics.
 Bengálí Hitopadesh, 40 pp. and Mádhav Chandra's Grammar,
 16 pp.
 Hindustání and Persian, Sawál o Jawáb and Panda Náma.

SECOND YEAR'S CLASS.—11 STUDENTS.

BRANCHES OF STUDY.

Bible, nearly the whole.—Horne's Manual of the Evidences of Christianity, the whole.—Jewish Calendar, &c.—Lectures on Christian Doctrines, 31 Lectures.
 History of Charles Vth. 382 pp.—Cowper's Poems, first Book of the Task.
 Leechman's Logic, the whole.—English Composition.
 Geometry, Heights and Distances, Mensuration of Surfaces, Land Surveying, Mensuration of the Circle.
 Algebra, Arithmetical and Geometrical Progression, Binomial Theorem, Theory of Logarithms and Logarithmic Arithmetic.
 Mylne's Astronomy, the whole.—Practical Astronomy.—Construction and use of the Sextant.
 Brewster's Optics.
 Bengálí, Hitopadesh, 47 pp. Mádhav Chandra's Grammar, 25 pp.
 Hindustání and Persian, Sawál o Jawáb and Panda Náma, 28 pp.
 Bengálí and English versions.

THIRD YEAR'S CLASS.—8 STUDENTS.

BRANCHES OF STUDY.

Bible, Paley's Evidences, Lectures on Theology.
 Clift's Political Economy, the whole.—Milton's Paradise Lost, four books.
 Duncan's Conic Sections, the whole.—Solid Geometry, eleventh and twelfth books of Euclid.
 Physical and Practical Astronomy, use of instruments;—Text Books, Mylne and Herschel.
 Statics, including the Composition and Resolution of forces, Mechanical powers, &c.
 Brewster's Optics.
 Mental Philosophy, Dr. Brown's first vol. and part of second vol.
 Bengálí, Mádhav Chandra's Grammar, &c.
 Hindustání, four Gospels, Chár Darvesh, and Hindustání Reader.

FOURTH YEAR'S CLASS.—8 STUDENTS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

Have finished all the preceding branches of study, together with a full course of Analytical Trigonometry, and Analytical Geometry; and during the present Session have studied—
Bible. Brown's Mental Philosophy, first vol. and part of second vol.

Thomson's Differential Calculus—the whole.

———— Integral Calculus—first principles.

Laplace's Mechanique Celeste, first chap.

Essays on different subjects.

PREPARATORY AND NORMAL SCHOOL.**FIRST OR HIGHEST CLASS.—32 SCHOLARS.****BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

New Testament, two Gospels and part of the Acts.—Horne's Manual of the Evidences, 65 pp.

History.—Marshman's Brief Survey, first and second vols., the whole.

———— History of India, down to A. D. 1450, 174 pp.

Goldsmith's History of England, to Charles I.

Murray's English Grammar.—Macculloch's Course of Reading, 167 pp.

Arithmetic, Simple Interest. Algebra, Division of Fractions.

Geometry, first and second books, and 20 props. of third book of Euclid.

Bengalí, Hitopadesh, 74 pp.

SECOND CLASS.—34 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

New Testament, Gospel by Matthew, part of Luke, and of John.

History, Brief Survey, whole of vol. first and 43 pp. vol. second.

Sessional School Collection, whole. Murray's Grammar, whole.

Arithmetic, Decimal Fractions.

Geography, Keith's Use of the Globes.

Geometry, all the first book of Euclid.

Bengalí, Hitopadesh, 47 pp.

THIRD CLASS.—36 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

History, Brief Survey, vol. first, 159 pp. Sessional School Collection, 180 pp.

Macculloch's Grammar, 136 pp. Clift's Geography, the whole.

Arithmetic, Single Rule of Three, Geometry, first book of Euclid, definitions and five props.

Bengálí, Hitopadesh, 34 pp. Translation into English and Bengálí.

FOURTH CLASS.—49 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

Fourth Instructor, 10 pp. Macculloch's Grammar, 164 pp.

History of Bengal, the whole. Brief Survey, vol. first, 24 pp.

Clift's Geography, the whole. Arithmetic, Compound Division.

Bengálí, Hitopadesh, 32 pp.

FIFTH CLASS.—50 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

Third Instructor, the whole. History of Bengal, 121 pp.

Macculloch's Grammar, 152 pp. Clift's Geography, the whole.

Arithmetic, Compound Multiplication.

Bengálí, Hitopadesh, 20 pp.

SIXTH CLASS.—74 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

Third Instructor, the whole. History of Bengal, 48 pp.

Macculloch's Grammar, 152 pp. Clift's Geography, 28 pp.

Arithmetic, Reduction. English writing.

Bengálí, Hitopadesh, 15 pp.

SEVENTH CLASS.—88 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

Third Instructor, 137 pp. History of Bengal, 16 pp.

Macculloch's Grammar, 68 pp. Clift's Geography, 14 pp.

English writing.

Bengálí, Chánakhya Slok, the whole.

—— Rám Mohan Ráy's Grammar, 4 pp.

EIGHTH CLASS.—71 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

Third Instructor, 50 pp. Macculloch's Grammar, 50 pp. (to the verb.)

English writing. Bengálí, Chánakhya Slok, the whole.

NINTH CLASS.—62 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

Third Instructor, 17 pp. Abridgment of Grammar, the whole.

English writing. Bengálí, Chánakhya Slok, 30 pp.

TENTH CLASS.—77 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

Second Instructor, 24 pp. Abridgment of Grammar, 16 pp. (on to verb). English writing.

Bengálí Spelling Book, the whole. Chánakhya Slok, 12 pp.

ELEVENTH CLASS.—79 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

Second Instructor, 14 pp. Grammar, parts of Speech. English and Bengálí writing.

Bengálí Spelling Book, 40 pp. Chánakhya Slok, 6 pp.

TWELFTH CLASS.—71 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

First Instructor, nearly finished. English and Bengálí writing.

THIRTEENTH CLASS.—50 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

First Instructor, 8 pp. Bengálí writing.

FOURTEENTH CLASS.—48 SCHOLARS.**BRANCHES OF STUDY.**

First Instructor, 3 pp. Bengálí writing.

B.

The Eleventh Annual Examination of the General Assembly's Institution.

The most gratifying of all public exhibitions of this nature—the Annual Examination of the pupils of the General Assembly's Institution—took place at the Town Hall yesterday (22nd Jan.) There were about sixty* Ladies and Gentlemen present to witness this peculiarly gratifying sight; and among them were a great number of clerical gentlemen of all denominations.

Since the last examination, improved arrangements have been suggested and adopted in the institution. Owing to the advanced studies of the senior classes, the school has been divided into two departments:—The preparatory and the collegiate. From a note appended to the programme, it appeared, that “the studies in the latter department are so arranged as to occupy in regular succession a period of at least four years:”—an arrangement the very introduction of which among the native youths of the country must enhance still higher the intrinsic merit of this noble institution.

From the criterion afforded by the examination and the list of the studies of the classes respectively exhibited in the programme, it was satisfactorily shown that the institution continues to vindicate its pre-eminence in extended and sterling usefulness. The examination was particularly calculated to afford high satisfaction to every heart that glows with interest in the promotion of the rising generation of natives, to moral and intellectual worth.
—*Hurkaru.*

We have watched the progress of the Assembly's Institution for many years with the intensest interest. It gave to Christian education a concentratedness and force which it had never possessed before in this country. We say this without in the slightest degree wishing either to detract from the excellent plans of the pioneers in the good work of Christian education, or of unduly exalting those who were directed in the providence of God, to adopt measures evidently in consonance with the divine arrangement, but with a view to give honor where it is due,

* This must denote the average number *present at one time*—not the aggregate number *present altogether*. From multiplicity of business scarcely any of the gentlemen could remain above an hour. This led of course to perpetual fluctuation; so that the entire number present *throughout the day* would be *double or treble* the number present *at one time*.

where God has himself manifestly bestowed it. Some missions have been distinguished for their labors in translations—others for composing and printing useful works—others in preaching;—and it has been the lot of our Scottish brethren to be eminent in providing an educational institution every way worthy the cause they desire to propagate, and well calculated, under the divine blessing, to attain and exert an important influence over the higher order of schools in which religion is not taught, and over the more intelligent portion of the native community. Such being the case we have watched with the deepest anxiety the progress of the Assembly's Institution—not its progress in itself so much, though this is of the deepest moment, and it has been steady and gratifying; the laborers have sustained their parts with unabated ardour and zeal, converts have been afforded to stimulate them in their work, and conviction of the truth of our holy faith has been generally impressed on the majority if not all the matured youth connected with the Institution, giving promise of a future and extensive harvest. This is cheering enough, but the external progress and growing influence of the Institution is still more invigorating. The number of the pupils continues to increase, and this notwithstanding the conversions which have happened, and the alarms which have been sounded in the very fortress of Hindu society. The masculine efforts which bigotted Hindus, and the more polished Vedantists have made to thin the ranks and diminish the influence of the Institution—private influence and public prohibitions—maternal affection and parental authority—the influence of the press, and the prospect of highest patronage, have not been able to prevent a constant accession to the numbers of the pupils. This shows that there is a strong feeling of confidence in the conductors of this excellent Seminary amongst the parents and guardians of the young men—confidence in their abilities, integrity, and perseverance; for it is a fact well known to the native community that the Missionaries would, if they could, bring every pupil from the darkness of Hinduism to the light of the gospel: but this impression is also identified with the idea now inseparable from Missionary Christianity in the native mind that no force save the force of reason and no power save that of the Spirit of God will be employed in the conversion of souls. We rejoice in this signal triumph of truth in so short a period, for who could gravely have predicted that at the eleventh annual examination of the Institution it should have gathered 800 pupils—have had a most erudite and eloquent essay read on the highest of all subjects by a convert—the most talented pupil in its college department,—and that it should have exerted an influence so potent even over the minds of adult Hindus as to lead them (despite all kinds of influence exerted to produce a contrary effect) to commit the religious training of their children

to the hands of Christian Missionaries;—but so it is, and not only in connection with this seminary, but every other similar institution in this and the sister presidencies. We are especially gratified by the testimony of our native contemporary, the *Bhaskar*, to the usefulness and the laudableness of Missionary labor, and especially of Christian Schools—in fact, the testimony of all our contemporaries, whatever private views they may cherish, to the disinterestedness, perseverance and successful efforts of Missions in this department, is one of those signs of the times which should be a source of encouragement to persevere in the good cause, through good and evil report, until success shall *command* that which the enmity of the human heart will not at the onset of such labors admit can flow from the efforts of Christian Missionaries.—*Calcutta Christian Observer*.

It is a delightful fact connected with the history of this Institution, that many of its pupils should have so drunk at the fountain of knowledge as to remain to matured life in order that they may reap the reward of all their past toils in acquiring the highest branches of knowledge and the highest honors of the school. A department for carrying on the higher branches of knowledge, called the college department, has been instituted during the past year. But that which is most delightful in connection with this institution is, that, notwithstanding the bold and fearless advocacy by its founders and teachers of an uncompromising Christian education, and of their intention if prospered by God to convert their pupils to the Christian faith, it should more than equal in numbers the *patsala* and college which has Government for its patron, and in which Christianity is systematically expelled, the Bible prohibited, inquiry on religion unsanctioned, and God himself almost excluded;—and yet so it is, and so it ever will be, that a faithful straightforward determination to teach men the truth, shall secure the confidence (even of those who are heedless of that truth themselves) in those who profess to be the preceptors of the rising race. Let our friends, and all similarly engaged, but pursue their honorable and faithful course, and the time will not be far distant when these seminaries where God and our Lord Jesus are honored, shall so secure the confidence of the whole native population, that institutions in which men are afraid to teach any, even their own faith, shall be left as a monument of the folly of an age which thought that God would permit man to guide his creatures into the way of happiness without instructing them in the knowledge of Himself—as he formerly left a nation still grovelling amid the twilight of a prostrate reason, who would have worshipped that reason instead of himself, to become the prey of every guilty passion unchecked even by the socialities of a nominal Christianity.—*Advocate*.

The first fact of peculiar interest that presented itself on this occasion, was the numerical prosperity of the Institution. After the class lists had been expurgated by the exclusion of all absentees for whose absence a satisfactory reason had not been given, the number of pupils still stood so high as *Eight Hundred and Seventy*; which shows an increase of two hundred and ten, above the strength of last year. Of this great body of pupils, a division has been made, which the progress of their education more than warrants. The Institution, now embraces in itself both a College, and a Preparatory and Normal School; in the former of which there are 49 pupils, and in the latter 821. No one will dispute the claim to the appellation of a Collegiate Institution, of a Seminary, where Brown's Philosophy and Laplace's *Mechanique Celeste* are text books in Mental and Physical Science.

Both the number and the attainments of the pupils have risen far too high, to allow of any thing like an adequate exhibition of the state of the Institution, in a popular examination of a few hours. The perusal of the Programme which, for the satisfaction of our readers we subjoin, will give a better idea of that, than any report of the examination. The literal justification of the Programme, by a detailed examination of the various classes in their several studies, seemed to have been abandoned in despair by the Examiners. Of the School department, the higher classes were thrown into one, and then questioned freely on any branch of their studies which was suggested at the moment. Much the same process was adopted by the Collegians. They were led discursively through the mazes of Mental Philosophy, Mathematics, Practical Astronomy, and History, both Sacred and Profane; and in every thing, gave proof of the thoroughgoing instruction to which they have been accustomed. In Mental Philosophy, the exercise was rather an extemporaneous disputation than an examination: and much animation, was thrown into it by the suggestions of Captain Richardson. It shewed great power of thought. A prize Essay, in the same department of study, by Mahendra Lall, the Christian convert, was partly read, and corresponded exactly with the intellectual character displayed by himself and his fellow-students in the argumentation of the day. This young man also carried off Mr. Macfarlan's gold medal for the Student of highest general proficiency; for the assigning of which, a searching examination by written questions and answers, without books or assistance of any kind had been conducted for, we believe, six days, for about five hours each day. By this ordeal he had acquired a place much above all the other competitors. He also obtained a silver medal for an Essay respecting the Jews.—*Friend of India.*

The annual examination of the General Assembly's School was held on Friday last, and was attended by many respectable English Gentlemen and Natives.

The examiners and spectators were much pleased with the answers given to the several questions put to the scholars. The Missionaries are worthy of boundless praise for the money they spend and the labours they undertake for the benefit of all persons ; Mr. Alexander Duff especially by the gift of knowledge, enlightens the eyes of many of the natives of this country ; therefore the gratitude which the people of this country owe him, is beyond measure inexpressible.

Some may say that the Missionaries impart knowledge with the view of bringing people under their influence ; that is, their desire is to cause the professors of other religions to become Christians : on this account, through the medium of an English education they endeavour to engage the affections of their pupils in the worship of Christ. We also confess that it is indeed their great aim to bring people to embrace the religion of Christ, but the Missionaries ought not to be reproached on this account ; because all sects endeavour to convert others to their own religion. This practice it is well known exists even among Hindu sects, such as the Shaktos and the Baisnobs and others ; the Hindus indeed do not expend either money or labour to spread their religion, but the Missionaries do this to the utmost of their ability and are therefore worthy of the greater praise. Those whose children are educated in Mr. Duff's school ought to think upon the many benefits, which that kind-hearted and excellent gentleman has conferred upon them ; the parents are not put to the expense of a single pice for the education of their children ; that gentleman has gone about begging money in various countries, and expends it in filling the treasury of these children's minds with the riches of knowledge. Now these riches may be employed by his pupils in the support of their families without being exhausted, and with care and reflection they may pass their days in comfort. The parents of these scholars brought them into this world indeed, but Mr. Duff, by giving them the eyes of knowledge, has imparted to them the riches by which they can pass their time in comfort with their families, and having respectfully invited them, he has delighted them by the impartation of inexhaustible riches. Where can they find such a benevolent friend as Mr. Duff ?—therefore the fathers and grandfathers of these children ought to call upon that gentleman, and by some mark of respect express their great gratitude.—*Translated from the Bhaskar for the Calcutta Christian Observer.*

C.

Questions and Answers, &c.

(See Statement, pages 14 and 15.)

SCRIPTURE THEOLOGY.

1 *Question*.—What period of the world's history is embraced by the Christian Scriptures?

Answer.—The period of the world's history embraced by the Christian Scriptures extends from the creation to the end of the world, as that history, in so far as it is touched upon, is either *narrated or prophesied* in the Holy Scriptures.

2 *Q*.—With the histories of what chief empires of the world is the Bible connected? and what advantage arises to us from such connexion?

A.—The *chief empires* of the world with whose histories the Bible is connected, are Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Media, Persia and Syria; and the histories of all kingdoms and countries round about Judea are more or less connected with the Bible history. The advantage that accrues to us from this connection is more or less evidence in proof of the *authenticity* of the Bible.—(And if prophecy be included, evidence arises for the *divine origin of the Bible* from the fulfilment of prophecies regarding Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Idumea, Tyre, &c.)

3 *Q*.—What were the peculiar characteristics of the Patriarchal Dispensation?—and who were the chief characters under it?

A.—Some *peculiar characteristics* in the patriarchal dispensation were, that God himself from time to time made to the patriarchs a few *simple* revelations concerning Himself, His will, and His purposes,—which revelations descended *orally* through the line of the patriarchs. The chief characters under the patriarchal dispensation were Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph.

4 *Q*.—What was the translation of Enoch calculated to teach his cotemporaries?

A.—The translation of Enoch was calculated to teach his cotemporaries that there is a next world, and perhaps the resurrection of the body, and that God delights in righteousness.

5 *Q*.—What was the grand characteristic of Abraham as a saint, and how was it illustrated?

A.—The grand characteristic of Abraham as a saint was *faith*; and it was illustrated thus:—he *believed* the promise of God that

He will give him a son when his wife was barren, and both he and she were old. And it was also illustrated when Abraham was about to offer up his son of promise—(of whom it had been said by God that multitudes would come forth from this son and inherit the land of Canaan)—a burnt-offering to the Lord.

6 Q.—What was the immediate office, and what was the ultimate end of the Jewish Priesthood ?

A.—The hereditary priesthood of the Jews was given by God to the Levites to preside over the *spiritual economy* of the people. It was to last as long as the Mosaic dispensation lasted ; and it prefigured, especially in the case of the high priest, the priesthood of our great High Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ.

7 Q.—Wherein did the Jewish sacrifice of atonement differ from the sacrifices of the heathen ?

A.—The Jewish sacrifices were types of the great Sacrifice that was afterwards to be offered up. They were deemed of themselves to be insufficient to take away sin, but pointed out the coming Saviour. The heathen sacrifices had nought of this meaning ; but were thought of *themselves* sufficient to take away sin.

8 Q.—What makes the sacrifice of Christ sufficient for the redemption of sinners ?

A.—Since Christ was God, and therefore independent, *his* sacrifice was acceptable unto the Father ; and his sacrifice, being the sacrifice of God, became *infinite in value*, and therefore *sufficient* for the redemption of sinners. Christ himself was wholly without sin, and therefore no sacrifice became necessary for his *own* sin.

9 Q.—How may it be said that faith saves a sinner ?

A.—*Faith* is the *instrument* whereby the benefits of salvation purchased by Christ and freely offered in the covenant of grace are received by the sinner. It is the divinely-appointed *instrument*, *not the cause*, of man's salvation.

10 Q.—What, in few words, is the difference between Justification and Sanctification ?

A.—Justification is the taking away of the *guilt* of sin. Sanctification is the taking away of its *power*.

11 Q.—What is the connection between Pardon and Heaven, and between Holiness and Heaven ?

A.—Pardon of sin gives *title* to one to *enter* heaven, and holiness *fits* and *prepares* him for the state of heaven.

12 Q.—What is repentance, in the fewest possible words ? and what is its use, seeing that men are forgiven through an atonement ?

A.—Repentance is sorrow for past sin and a turning away from it in future life. Its use is to make a man *morally able* to accept of salvation here, and prepare him to enjoy in a heaven of holiness hereafter.

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

1 Q.—What is prophecy ?

A.—Prophecy is the foretelling of some future event or events above all that can be foretold by the exercise of man's natural powers.

2 Q.—A history of Christ from the prophecies.

A.—It was prophesied concerning Christ that he should be the seed of the virgin ; that he should be born in Bethlehem ; that the spirit of the Lord should rest upon him ; that he should have the spirit of meekness, gentleness and righteousness ; that he should open the eyes of the blind, cause the dumb to speak, and the lame to leap as the hart ; that he should suffer for the iniquity of the people ; that he should be led as a lamb before his shearers and should not open his mouth ; that he should be put to death on the cross for sinners ; that he should be buried with the rich ; that he should not suffer corruption ; that he should be a king ; and “ the Lord our Righteousness.” In short, the character of Christ as a man, his character as a king, his office as the mediator, his miracles, his last sufferings and death, the nature of his person, and many other peculiarities in his life when upon the earth,—and lastly his kingdom, the nature of that kingdom, the extent of that kingdom, were all subjects of prophecy.

3 Q.—A succinct account of the argument for the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament.

A.—The New Testament is *genuine* ; that is, written by the very persons whose names its several parts bear : because I. There is no proof on the contrary. II. The genuineness is proved from the Hebrew phraseology in the Greek New Testament. III. From the testimonies of the Christians of the first three centuries who were qualified to judge of the matter. IV. From the quotations of the New Testament in the works of writers from the middle of the first century down to the present time. V. From early translations still existing.—(And if uncorrupted preservation be included)—VI. From the agreement of all manuscripts, all versions in all countries of the world.

The New Testament is *authentic*, that is, it relates transactions that *really* happened. For, the enemies of the gospel in the first centuries did not deny the *facts* of gospel history,—neither the Jews nor the Gentiles : when they had the best opportunity to know whether these were real facts, and the interest to disprove, if false. (Celsus, a heathen philosopher ascribed the miracles of Christ to magic ; still he does *not* deny the reality of the miracles).

Secondly, The writers of the gospels were eye witnesses of the facts they relate.

Thirdly, They were no enthusiasts.

Fourthly, They were men of *verity*; because,

(I.) There is internal evidence in their writings that they were so.

(II.) They gave up their lives in attestation of these facts;—suffering reproach, shame, ignominy, all earthly disadvantage.

(III.) The heathen writers of the first centuries attested that these men were honest;—as Lucian.

4 Q.—The evidence for the resurrection of Christ.

A.—There is abundant evidence that Christ really rose from the dead. The soldiers were watching at the sepulchre; and fear of life, and the call of duty would not allow them to neglect watching. They were many, and therefore they could not all fall asleep. The disciples could not steal the body for this guard. Besides, the disciples were men full of fear. If the Jews kept the body of Jesus, then, when the disciples preached that he was risen from the dead, they would have produced his body: therefore really Christ rose from the dead. (If the history of Christ be authentic, then we may believe his resurrection simply because the disciples said they saw Christ after his crucifixion, and ate and talked with him.)

5 Q.—State and answer Hume's objections to miracles.

A.—Our experience of the veracity of human testimony, says Mr. Hume, is *variable*; but our experience of the uniformity of nature's sequences is *invariable*; therefore, since a *miracle* is a *violation* of the laws of nature which are *invariable*, *no* human testimony can make us believe the taking place of a miracle; for, says he, testimony *may* be false; the laws of nature *cannot* vary. This is a fallacious argument. It is a *petitio principii*. For, he ought to have proved that the laws of nature *have never varied*. We say there *has* been variation when miracles took place; he says no, let him prove so. This he does not; he takes it for granted. Again, we say, that the testimony of a *sane honest* man in reference to *facts* which he saw is *invariably true*; whereas he would lead his readers to think that *every* kind of human testimony is *variably* true, may be true or not. Again, we say God is *not bound* never to produce an effect *directly* by his power, but by the interference of physical or instrumental causes, even when the spiritual necessities of his intellectual creatures require that interference. Again, if Revelation be necessary, and if Revelation be made, it can be made in no other way than by a miracle. Therefore Hume's objection has no weight.

6 Q.—Answer the objection to the destruction of the Canaanites.

A.—The Canaanites were an idolatrous people, *impious rebels*; wherefore God might justly cut them off. And if in punishing them He made the Israelites the instruments, where is the injustice?

7 Q.—The argument for the Bible from the character of Christ.

A.—Never did a man live upon the earth as Christ. He was without sin. His life was holy, full of good works. Such a character, such a life never entered even the imagination of man. Such a man must therefore be what he said concerning himself: "I am come from God, and the words I speak, they are of the Father;" wherefore this is truth. Therefore Christianity is true.

8 Q.—from the character and condition of his apostles.

A.—The apostles were poor unlearned men, and yet they have left behind them a philosophy better than all philosophy of men; a code of morality purer far than all other codes existing in the world. How could this be, but for their divine inspiration? Again, the apostles were subject to persecution, shame, deaths, all manner of evil under the sun for the sake of delivering their testimony. Still they did deliver it even unto death, making their life one continued line of devotion, prayer, teaching, preaching and testifying unto all that Christ was the Son of God. How could this be but because these men were honest? The apostles preached what they believed themselves,—what they themselves acted upon.

9 Q.—from the inward witness.

A.—There is much evidence in the voice of our minds speaking secretly that Christianity is divine. We are struck with the coincidence between the description of human nature in the Bible, and that nature as we experience ourselves. We are struck with the *fitness* of the Saviour offered in the gospel. We *feel inwardly* the need of salvation, the necessity of which the Bible takes for granted. We *feel inwardly* the necessity of regeneration; we read in the Bible of the Regenerator—the Holy Spirit of God. And after we become Christians, however weak, only if sincere, we *feel* just as the Bible presupposes we shall feel. The truth of the Bible then is as easily felt as the truth of the existence of the food which we take. *Then a man feels the power of the Gospel.* Every day the gospel becomes to him truer and truer, if absolute truth can ever become more true. This is evidence for the truth of the Bible in ourselves. It is the strongest species of evidence to sincere Christians. No man can become such but he that is renewed by the Holy Ghost, and all this evidence is derived from His influence upon the spirit of man; therefore the Holy Spirit of God may emphatically be called, *the inward witness*.

10 Q.—from its effects on society where received and followed.

A.—If Christianity were universally followed, earth would become heaven. Look on the character of a true Christian; suppose all men were true Christians; say whether or not, then, men would resemble angels; whereas now they resemble devils. Look on the *actual effects* of Christianity as far as it is received, how

good and happy are these effects ! Could then Christianity be the production of liars ? of wicked men ? No. It must have come from the God of truth, as it professes.

10 Q.—Contrast Christianity and Hinduism.

A.—The learned theology of the Hindus acknowledges as its supreme God a qualityless being, non-moral, who is neither our Creator, nor Preserver, nor Governor. In fact this theology is *metaphysical nonsense*. By this, man must leave the world, go into the jungles, and there render himself a passionless being as a stone. If universally followed, children would not be born ; the world would be destroyed. What ! shall we compare Christianity with this ? Christianity raises man to his true honour, to glory ; refines his moral nature ; and instead of cutting off man's passions, sanctifies and purifies them ; in one word, turns an immoral, wicked, devilish world into a paradise, which contains a human species, enlivened, purified and sanctified, and living in universal and immortal love, and joy and happiness. *Popular Hinduism* is the mother of ignorance, superstition, vice, wickedness and misery. It is gross idolatry. Neither this nor the other can be compared with Christianity.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

1 Q.—Brief sketch of the history, so far as known to us, of the antediluvian world.

A.—In the beginning God created the Heaven and Earth out of nothing. Then he created all vegetables and animals upon the earth, man being created last. Adam was the first man, Eve the first woman, made out of Adam. Adam transgressed the commandment of God by eating the forbidden fruit through the instrumentality of Eve his wife, beguiled by Satan. God therefore cast them off from the garden of Eden. Adam's transgression brought death upon the world and all our wo. Cain and Abel were the first sons of Adam and Eve. Cain was a bad man ; but Abel was a good man. They both made offerings to God ; Cain offered fruits, and Abel a lamb. Cain was rejected ; but Abel was accepted. Cain therefore slew Abel. God also on this account punished Cain even in this life. Cain's descendants were great artists. Seth was another son of Adam and Eve. Enoch, one of his descendants was received up to heaven, because he walked with God. The world became more and more wicked, and therefore God destroyed it with a flood, yet after long forbearance. Noah, who preached righteousness to a wicked world was saved, with all his family, from the flood by an ark of his own making which occupied him 120 years.

2 Q.—Give an account of the Argonautic expedition, distinguishing what is probably true from what is clearly fabulous.

A.—The Argonautic expedition was undertaken by Jason, a Grecian chief, who sailed the Euxine and brought from Colchis the daughter of the king. This is probably the truth. There is also mixed with it much that is fabulous about the golden ram and fleece.

3 Q.—The war of Troy—Probable date—Chief leaders on both sides.

A.—The war of Troy took place between the Greeks and Trojans. Its probable date is 1184 B. C. Chief leaders on the side of the Greeks were Agamemnon, Achilles, Ajax ; on the side of the Trojans, Hector, Paris.

4 Q.—What were the chief of the Grecian states, who were their law-givers, and what were the chief distinctions in the characters of their people ?

A.—Sparta, Athens, Thebes. Lycurgus was the law-giver of Sparta, Draco and Solon those of Athens. The Spartans were a race of hard, robust warriors, simple, not much civilized. The Athenians were a civilized, refined, and rather a luxurious people ; and their chief strength consisted in their navy as that of the Spartans in land forces.

5 Q.—Helots—who ?

A.—The Helots were the slaves of the Spartans. They were conquered by the Spartans and reduced to slavery.

6 Q.—Name the chief countries governed by Cyrus.

A.—Cyrus's empire was all that vast territory between the Caspian sea, Persian gulf, India, and the Mediterranean sea. The chief countries were Media, Babylonia, Lydia and Syria.

7 Q.—What mention is made of Cyrus in Scripture ?

A.—Cyrus let out the Jews from captivity from Babylon.

8 Q.—What was the origin of the war between the Greeks and Persians ?

A.—The Greeks colonized into many parts of Asia Minor ; such as Ionia, Æolia, Doris. Petty disputes happened between these colonies and the Persians : and they were carried to the mother-country, Greece.

9 Q.—Battle of Leuctra—between whom fought—date, result.

A.—The battle of Leuctra was fought between Epaminondas the Theban general and the Spartans. Its date is about 376 B. C. The Thebans were victorious, and thus liberated themselves from the Spartan yoke under which they had for some time groaned.

10 Q.—Battle of the Granicus—Do.

A.—The battle at the river Granicus was fought between Alexander and the Persians. Its date is about 330 B. C.

11 Q.—Short sketch of the career of Alexander.

A.—Alexander was the greatest military commander of antiquity. He was young when he entered Persia in arms. His career was thus.—He crossed the Hellespont, fought at Granicus, traversed Asia Minor, fought at Issus, traversed Syria, Palestine, went to Egypt, returned to the heart of Persia, fought at Arbella, went to Persopolis and burnt it; sat upon the throne of Darius, came near the Caspian sea, fought for some time with the Scythians, came to Cabul, fought with Hindu princes, returned, on account of rain and the murmurs of his troops, moved down the Indus, passed through Gedrosia, and other southern provinces of Persia, became very intemperate in the way, died of a fever at Babylon caused by that intemperance. He was every where victorious in this career.

12 Q.—List of the Persian kings from Cyrus to the extinction of the monarchy.

A.—Cyrus, Cambyses, Smerdis, Darius, Xerxes, Artaxerxes, Xerxes II., Darius II., Artaxerxes II., Artaxerxes III., Darius Codomanus.

13 Q.—How was the empire of Alexander divided at his death?

A.—The empire of Alexander on his death was divided into four parts among his generals. Ptolemy received Egypt; Seleucus, Western Asia; Antigonus received Asia Minor; Cassander, Macedon.

14 Q.—What led to the residence of many Jews in Egypt in the fourth century B. C.; and what fact in reference to the transmission of the Old Testament Scriptures is connected with this?

A.—After the death of Alexander, the kings of Egypt and the Seleucidæ were involved in disputes with each other. Judea was torn with these disputes. It successively fell into the hands of the kings of Egypt or the Seleucidæ. One of the Ptolemies conquered the Jews when they rose up against him, carried them captive to Alexandria, and there the Old Testament was translated into the Greek language by seventy persons B. C. 280.

15 Q.—Name the kings of Rome with the conjoint length of their reigns; and mention which of them was a Grecian by birth.

A.—There were seven kings of Rome, Romulus, Numa, Tullus Hostilius, Ancus Martius, Tarquin, Tullus Servilius, Tarquin Superbus. Rome was built 752 B. C.; Tarquin was banished B. C. 509. The conjunct length of their reigns was 243 years. Tarquin the first was a Grecian by birth.

16 Q.—Horatii and Curiatii—story of.

A.—In the reign of Tullus Hostilius a war happened between the Romans and the Sabines. On one occasion it was decreed that victory would be decided by the fight of champions. Three

persons called Curiatii were selected on the side of the Sabines, three called Horatii on the side of the Romans. In this fight the Horatii were eventually victorious.

17 Q.—Licinian Rogations,—what?

A.—The Licinian Rogations were the laws of Licinus, a celebrated Roman. He said that none could become a senator who had not been a tribune, and had held other public offices in the state; that six military tribunes should be chosen annually, &c.

18 Q.—Second Punic war—cause—date of commencement and termination.

A.—The second Punic war arose out of the siege of Saguntum in Spain, which siege was laid by Hannibal the Carthaginian general. The people of Saguntum called the Romans for aid; and the Romans proudly ordered the Carthaginians to raise the siege. The Carthaginians did not hear their word. This was the origin of the second Punic war. It commenced about B. C. 240 and ended about B. C. 218.

19 Q.—Battle of Cannae,—between whom fought,—date,—result.

A.—Battle of Cannae was fought between Hannibal and the Romans B. C. 224. In this Hannibal was victorious, and almost became master of Italy.

20 Q.—Destruction of Carthage—short account of.

A.—In the third Punic war Carthage was besieged by the Romans. And the Carthaginians being greatly distressed sought for terms of peace, which were offered indeed by the Roman general, but were too severe for them, nay, rather insulting. The Carthaginians therefore resolved to hold out to the last. They, however, notwithstanding the readiness with which all ranks of the people, nay the women also, lent their aid to defend it, were unable to defend the city. In this plight they set Carthage on fire and consumed themselves and all theirs in the flames.

21 Q.—What was the step by which Caesar commenced the civil war.

A.—Before the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, Caesar was governor of Gaul, and Pompey was the first man in Rome. Some petty quarrels about receiving tribuneship, when out of the capital, were in truth the cause of the civil war. But the first event step in this war was Caesar's crossing a river in the north of Italy at the head of an army, which, according to Roman laws, should not be crossed over, under such circumstances, without orders from the senate or chief men in Rome.

22 Q.—Name the members of the first and second Triumvirates.

A.—Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus were the members of the first Triumvirate. Octavius, Antony and Lepidus of the second.

23 Q.—Give an account of Pompey's last battle.

A.—This battle was fought at Pharsalia in Thessaly between Caesar and Pompey. Caesar's troops were hardy warriors; Pompey's beautiful youths. Caesar was victorious in this battle.

24 *Q.*—Battle of Actium,—date,—leaders—results.

A.—The Battle of Actium was a naval engagement between Octavius and Antony. Its date is about B. C. 29. Octavius was victorious in this battle, and Antony fled to Egypt.

25 *Q.*—Christ's birth—how long after the building of Rome?

A.—Rome was built B. C. 752.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

1 *Q.*—Give a definition of Political Economy.

A.—The grand object of *Political Economy* is, *wealth*. It treats of the laws which regulate the *production* and *distribution* of wealth; more especially the *natural laws*; but also, though not peculiarly, the *social laws*.

2 *Q.*—Give a definition of wealth.

A.—Any thing that possesses *value in exchange* is *wealth*.

3 *Q.*—What is the origin of wealth?

A.—Labour whether mental or bodily, whether directly by the hands, or indirectly by instruments, is the *origin* of wealth.

4 *Q.*—Give instances showing that mere fertility of soil does not ensure wealth.

A.—Asia Minor, Turkey in Europe, Syria and Palestine, some of the most fertile countries in the world, contain *poor* and miserable inhabitants, showing that *mere fertility of soil* does not ensure wealth.

5 *Q.*—What are the two branches of Political Economy?

A.—Political Economy divides itself into two branches; the one treats of the laws which regulate the *production*, the other of those which regulate the *distribution* of wealth.

6 *Q.*—Enumerate the circumstances which increase the efficiency of labour.

A.—I. Knowledge, II. Division of labour, III. Exchange, IV. Accumulation of capital, V. Security of property.

7 *Q.*—Give some examples illustrating the influence of knowledge in furthering individual and national prosperity.

A.—A common peasant of Great Britain is far more comfortable and happy than a prince among the poor and miserable races in the interior and east of Africa, illustrating in a clear manner the influence of knowledge in furthering *individual* prosperity. Again, the people of a small and comparatively barren island of Great Britain are probably the richest, surely the most

powerful nation upon the earth, while the people of Hindustan, a country fifteen times, or probably more times, as large as the whole of Great Britain, are, compared to the British, a poor and powerless race, illustrating clearly the influence of knowledge in furthering *national prosperity*. Contrast also the state of the United States *now*, inhabited by an *enlightened* nation, with the state of the *same* country when the poor and miserable Indian dwelt amidst its huge forests.

8 Q.—What is the duty of Hindus with reference to the increase of knowledge ?

A.—The duty of the Hindus, with reference to the increase of knowledge, is evidently this, that they *pay* for the education they receive ; that they should make a *general spirit* in them to value education and *pay* for it. It is also the duty of educated Hindus to *reduce their knowledge to practice*.

9 Q.—What are the natural circumstances most favourable to the cultivation of knowledge ?

A.—Some of these circumstances are those connected with the *localities* of particular countries. A people dwelling near the sea, for example, would probably become acquainted with navigation far sooner, and better acquainted with it, than a people dwelling in an inland country. But the natural circumstances *most* favourable to the cultivation of knowledge are those connected with the *increase of population* ; which at once supplies the *motives* to improve the arts of life for increased sustenance, and the *means* to carry into full accomplishment these motives, in the exercise of more numerous and vigorous talents surely to be found among a *more numerous* people.

10 Q.—Give proofs of the beneficial effects of the Division of labour.

A.—If labour were divided, the same quantity of work would be done far sooner, and done in a far better manner, than if one person, even if it were *possible* for *one* person to do it, did the same work, taking to himself as many number of *times* as there was number of persons in the division of labour. For example, a *greater* quantity of work would be done, and done in a *far better way*, by 10 persons in six days, than if *one* person *laboured* for 60 days. These are some proofs of the beneficial effects of the division of labour. Division of labour also leads to the invention of machinery ; facilitates exchange ; reduces the price of commodities ; increases the amount of capital far sooner and infinitely more powerfully than if there were no such division. In fact, the beneficial effects of the division of labour are incalculable.

11 Q.—What are the original causes of division of labour.

A.—The *original causes* of the division of labour are to be traced in the *diversities* of the mental endowments and bodily structure, of natural inclinations, tastes, which prevail among men.

12 Q.—What circumstances limit the division of labour ?

A.—The market limits the division of labour.

13 Q.—What circumstances facilitate and extend division of labour.

A.—The increase of the market extends division of labour; or, which is the same thing, increase of population facilitates and extends division of labour.

14 Q.—What is meant by *territorial division of labour*?

A.—By territorial division of labour we mean the division of labour in different territories, in making different kinds of articles for which those countries are respectively fitted.

15 Q.—Give instances showing the advantages of mutual intercourse between different countries.

*A.—Thus, the mutual intercourse between Britain and India does good to both these countries. The people of Britain receive rice, cotton, sugar, indigo from Hindustán, and return in their stead all kinds of cutlery and prepared cloth. Britain gives to France her cutlery; France returns Britain her wine. Now, if there were no intercourse between Britain and any other country, she *could never have been supplied* with rice, sugar, cotton. And India, on the other hand, could never have received such cutlery. And even if it were possible, without mutual intercourse, the articles which are now received from foreign countries, would then have been raised at home in *smaller quantity, more laboriously*, to be sold at a *greater price*.*

16 Q.—What consequences would follow from free trade in corn, and whether would they on the whole prove beneficial or the contrary?

*A.—If the trade of corn were free, the price of corn being much lowered, lands at home which raise corn of a greater price, must lie uncultivated. For, none will raise corn in his own land in order to suffer loss by the raising of that corn. The agricultural party would thus suffer exceedingly. But persons then would more intensely bend their attention to *manufactures*. I think, it would have been better if there *were no* such restrictions on corn trade. But the abolition of these restrictions at present all at once, would do good in one way, evil in another. The question is difficult whether that abolition would prove beneficial or not. Probably, for some time it would be *injurious* were it *now* to take place, but *afterwards beneficial*.*

17 Q.—What are the circumstances which have led all nations to adopt the use of money.

*A.—Money is the medium of exchange. And since exchange is necessary for the formation of society as well as its comfort and happiness, exchange existed as soon as men formed themselves into society. Now if there be exchange, it is necessary that there be *some medium* of exchange. Take an example. A person is a shoemaker, another is a keeper of herds, a third is a butcher. How shall these exchange their articles with advantage*

without a medium ? The butcher wants a pair of shoes, and goes to the shoemaker, but the latter says he has no need of the butcher's articles. The keeper of herds goes to the shoemaker, but he says he has no need of herds. Now, how can exchange under these circumstances take place ? Besides, had the shoemaker need of the articles of both these persons, his one pair of shoes might be equal in value to $\frac{1}{3}$ rd cow of the herdsman. But the herdsman does not wish to divide his cow. How then can there be exchange ? Difficulties like these, in their various nature, and of greater or less amount, led all nations to adopt *money* as the *medium of exchange*.

18 Q.—What are the advantages of employing the precious metals ?

A.—The precious metals have much value in small parts ; are divisible considerably ; and any number of pieces of metal can be made exactly equal ; are enduring, not worn out by use like cloth ; are steady in value (steady, not *exactly* fixed, but nearly so) at different times and in different places.

19 Q.—How have governments often endeavoured to pay their debts ?

A.—They have done so by changing the former real value of coined money, and giving an arbitrary value on a smaller coin, for their own interests. Thus the governments of Britain and France robbed (we may say) their subjects. An English pound at present is much less in bulk than what it was.

20 Q.—Show how a nation may have too much money.

A.—If money be *not circulated*, if it be *not used* ; if it be kept in the house in the same manner as some fine stones are kept hidden for ages in some dark caverns ;—if such be the state of money in any country, that country has too much money.

21 Q.—How many kinds of Paper-money are there ?

A.—Three ; namely, bills of exchange, promissary notes, and notes issued by banks.

22 Q.—What advantages are derived from Paper-money ?

A.—Paper-money evidently facilitates exchange ; being itself a *medium of exchange* ; and since it answers the same purposes, in many cases, as metal money, a great advantage arises out of this. The *medium of exchange* is enlarged by the introduction of Paper-money. And as a *medium of exchange* metal-money itself is of so much value.

23 Q.—Are bank-notes any addition to the national wealth, or are they not ?

A.—Bank-notes are an addition to national wealth in the same manner as metal-money. If rupees, without any reference to the various important uses into which the silver of the rupees may be turned, form a part of national wealth, bank-notes, though not in the same degree as rupees, but still in the same *manner*, are an addition to national wealth.

24 Q.—Give a definition of capital.

A.—Capital is something to *profit with*. For example, the shoes in the shoemaker's shop are his capital.

25 Q.—Mention some of the chief advantages of accumulation.

A.—Without accumulation of capital the state of the increase of wealth is by no means good. The increase of wealth, the increase of the comforts and happiness of a nation are therefore the chief advantages of the accumulation of capital.

26 Q.—What are the chief sources of accumulation ?

A.—Profits are the chief sources of accumulation.

27 Q.—What inference with regard to accumulation would you draw from a permanent and universal fall of profits ?

A.—We shall infer less accumulation of capital as appears from the last answer.

28 Q.—Besides the materials for saving, what else must there be to raise a country to commercial prosperity ?

A.—Large profits, or at least *no less rate* of profits.

29 Q.—What is the only circumstance connected with the acceleration of the progress of wealth with which governments can advantageously interfere ?

A.—Security of property.

30 Q.—Prove the necessity of appropriation in order that a community may increase in prosperity.

A.—If there were no appropriation, no man would labour for the *common stock* ; nay, will scarcely labour at all, except by force. This will appear from the lying of lands uncultivated which *belong to no persons exclusively*. Wherefore, *appropriation is necessary* that men may labour, and labour hard *in pursuit* of their own happiness, while truly they are increasing national wealth and prosperity.

31 Q.—What are the advantages of appropriation ?

A.—The answer to this question has been anticipated briefly in the preceding answer.

32 Q.—Give examples proving that Governments have often proved false to the trust reposed in them.

A.—As it is in Turkey in Europe especially, where all the houses in which the people dwell belong to the Sultan, who constantly robs his rich subjects of all their property. This is always done in an arbitrary government when the king is tyrannical, or when the chief men of the country are covetous. Examples of the unfaithfulness of governments in this respect are to be found in the history of almost every nation.

33 Q.—Give arguments against slavery derived from the arguments in favour of the security of property.

A.—If it be proper that men's property should be *secure*, why is it improper that *men's persons* should be secure, that men's liberty of thought and body be secure, as far as it is man's prerogative to be *so free* ?

34 Q.—Are there any arguments against the institution of caste, as it exists among the Hindus, to be derived from this subject ?

A.—Yes. For, why should a man be *bound* to a certain kind of occupation ? Why should not a man of low caste—if he be able to do things appropriated to men of higher caste,—*why* should he not do them ? Why should not a man's *choice of trade* be secure ? Why should there be no liberty of thought and action ? of trade and traffic ? Why should one of great mental endowments be forced to be a cooly merely because he happens to be one of *low* caste ?

35 Q.—Does security of property injure the poor ? or the contrary ?

A.—It *blesses* the poor.

36 Q.—What kind of value is it with which Political Economy has to do ?

A.—It is the *value in exchange*. Air has much value, because we live thereby ; but the political economist has nothing to do with this value.

37 Q.—In what does the value of a commodity consist ?

A.—The *value* of a commodity is its relation to all other commodities in as far as the former may be exchanged for any of the latter.

38 Q.—What is the least unfit standard of the value of a commodity ?

A.—Its price.

39 Q.—Show the advantages of the standard alluded to.

A.—The advantages of the standard is, that price is *comparatively steady*.

40 Q.—What determines temporarily the price of commodities ?

A.—The relation of demand and supply determines *temporarily* the price of commodities.

41 Q.—In what do all permanent variations in price originate ?

A.—*Cost of production*.

42 Q.—What land pays no *rent* to the landlord ?

A.—The *worst* land that is cultivated ; the land of the least fertility.

43 Q.—Give a general expression for rent.

A.—Rent is something given to the landlord whose land is *not least fertile*, whose land is of greater fertility than many other lands cultivated.

44 Q.—Prove that rent is not a constituent element of price.

A.—Rent is *not* in the *least affected* by price. For it originates with the degree of fertility of some land as *superior* to the fertility of other lands, and is regulated *entirely* by the relation of the degree of fertility of that land with the fertility of other lands, superior or inferior. Suppose land of the least fertility given by a landlord to a farmer for cultivation ; and suppose the price of

the produce of that land is great, the farmer pays nothing to the landlord on account of greater price. He would give some rent, however, if worse lands were cultivated. Rent, however, *affects* price.

45 Q.—What determines the market rate of wages ?

A.—The relation between the supply of labour and the demand of the capitalist at the time.

46 Q.—What influence on wages is produced by the relation between capital and population ?

A.—If capital remains the *same* ; then, if population increase, and consequently the labourers increase, wages *fall* ; and if labourers decrease, wages rise. Again, if population and consequently the number of labourers remains the *same*, then if capital increases, wages rise ; if capital decreases, wages fall.

47 Q.—What is the only salutary check by which population may be kept down to the level of subsistence ?

A.—That salutary check is refraining from marriage under the guidance of *moral restraint*.

48 Q.—Whether are the effects of machinery on the whole injurious or advantageous as regards wages.

A.—The effects of machinery on wages are advantageous on the whole, though not *immediately and in every way*.

49 Q.—What are the two rates of wages called ?

A.—I. Necessary wages, the least by which a man can live ; II. Wages, which the habits, manners, customs of any country make it almost necessary for the labourers of that country to have.

50 Q.—What equalizes the profits of capital ?

A.—Wages.

51 Q.—What is the natural tendency of profits ?

A.—Their tendency is to *fall*.

52 Q.—What circumstances may temporarily check the natural tendency of profits ?

A.—Increase of population, and consequently fall of wages as when combined with rent ; or abundance of capital, and a small number of capitalists ; or the impulse given to one branch of trade not followed by *many* persons, or other circumstances of a temporary character.

LOGIC.

1 Q.—What are the parts into which Zeno's work on Logic are divided, and which of them properly belongs to Logic ?

A.—Zeno's logic was divided into three parts, the first treated of sequences, the second was reasoning as carried on in dialogues, and the third contained a method of wrangling whereby

one could confound any body. The second of these parts properly belongs to logic.

2 Q.—State and refute Mr. Locke's objections to Logic.

A.—Mr. Locke says that there are many persons who can reason well who know not logic. To this it may be answered that, though a man can do something practically, surely it is desirable and important that he know the *theory* of what he does. Every one will consent to this, that if one be naturally fitted to be a musician, it is essential that he should learn the science. Why then should that not be studied, which is the science or theory of reasoning, only because some persons without logic can reason well? Again, says Mr. Locke, the popular and common method of reasoning is simple, but the syllogistic method is unnatural, confused, obscure. This objection has no weight. For, the syllogistic reasoning is not one peculiar method of reasoning different from many others; but it is *the* form into which *all* correct reasoning may be reduced. Again, it is not necessary that, in order to make our reasoning logical we should have syllogisms, and syllogisms only, in our arguments; it is enough that our reasoning may be reduced into the syllogistic form.

3 Q.—What is Dr. Watts's error?

A.—Dr. Watts supposed that logic *included all science*; that logic was the *instrument* to lead us to truth of every sort. Metaphysics, and other sciences relating to the mind were, by this philosopher, considered as parts of logic.

4 Q.—Whether is Logic concerned with the subject about which we are reasoning, or the manner in which the process is conducted?

A.—Logic is concerned with the *manner of the reasoning process* which we carry on, and that alone; *not* the subjects about which we reason.

5 Q.—What is the proper province of Logic?

A.—The province of logic is to show us whether the *reasoning process* be sound; whether there be no mistake in the way in which one proposition is deduced from another or others, and nothing more. It has nothing to do with the subjects about which we reason; its office and only office is to show us *true reasoning*; *not* correct or true things reasoned about.

6 Q.—How many operations of the mind are there in every process of argumentation, and what are they?


A.—Three: Simple Apprehension; Judgment; Reasoning.

7 Q.—What is the mind engaged in doing in each of these operations?

A.—In Simple Apprehension the mind is employed in *conceiving* objects; in Judgment, it is employed in *comparing* those objects; in reasoning it is employed in deducing one truth *from* another truth respecting those objects.

8 Q.—Exhibit by a *tree* the various branches of the predica-
bles with their subordinate divisions.

A.—



9 Q.—What is judgment ?

A.—Judgment is that operation of the mind by which we com-
pare things whether they *agree* or *disagree*.

10 Q.—What is a proposition, and what are its constituent
parts ?

A.—A proposition is *judgment expressed in words* ; the sub-
ject, predicate and the copula are its constituent parts.

11 Q.—What are the several classes of propositions ?

A.—Propositions are either universal or particular, positive or
negative, pure or modal, hypothetical or categorical.

12 Q.—What are the four great classes, and by what symbols
are they denoted ?

A.—These four great classes are, universal positives, particular
positives, universal negatives, particular negatives, denoted by the
symbols A. I. E. O.

13 Q.—What are the rules to be observed with regard to dis-
tribution ?

A.—These rules are : that all *universals* distribute the *subject* ;
that all *negatives* distribute the *predicate*.

14 Q.—What is *Subalternation* ? and the maxims laid down in
reference to it ?

A.—Subalternation is the deducing of a particular proposition
from a universal one. The maxims laid down in reference to it
are the following : (I.) If the universals be true, the particulars
will also be true ; (II.) If the particulars be false, the universals
will also be false ; (III.) That both the universals and the parti-
culars may be together true or false.

15 Q.—What is *Conversion*, and what are the three kinds of it ?

A.—Conversion takes place when the terms of a proposition
are changed, and yet the truth of the matter of the proposition
remains unaltered. The three kinds of conversion are *simple*
conversion, *conversion per accidens*, *conversion by contraposition*.

* The answer does not give the subordinate divisions of the properties.

16 Q.—What are the three kinds of opposition, and when do these take place ?

A.—*Contradictory opposition*, *contrary opposition*, and *subcontrary opposition*. The first kind take place, between two propositions when the one is *universal*, and the other *particular*; the one *positive*, and the other *negative*. The second kind take place when *both* the propositions are *universal*, but the one *positive*, and the other *negative*. The third kind takes place, when *both* propositions are *particular*, but the one *positive*, and the other *negative*.

17 Q.—What does the third part of logic treat of ?

A.—Of reasoning or syllogisms.

18 Q.—What is a syllogism ?

A.—Syllogisms are reasoning embodied in words placed according to a certain order.

19 Q.—What are the constituent parts of a syllogism ?

A.—The *premises* and the *conclusion*. There are two premises, the major and the minor.

20 Q.—What are the two axioms on which the validity of affirmative and negative conclusions depends ?

A.—I. That if two terms *agree* with the *same third*, they will *agree* with *each other*. II. That if of two terms, one *agrees* with a third, and the other *disagrees* with the *same*, they will *disagree* with each other.

21 Q.—What are the six rules laid down for the construction of syllogisms ?

A.—These six rules are the following : I. That the middle term will *at least* be *once distributed* in the premises. II. That no term should be distributed in the conclusion which was not distributed in the premises. III. That from *two negative* premises no conclusion can be drawn. IV. That if *one* of the premises be *negative*, the conclusion will be *negative*. V. That from *two particular* premises no conclusion can be drawn. VI. That if *one* of the premises be *particular*, the conclusion will also be *particular*.

22 Q.—How many figures of syllogisms are there ? and what are their distinguishing characteristics ?

A.—There are four figures. In the first figure, the middle term is the subject of the major premise, and the predicate of the minor. In the second figure, the middle term is the predicate of both the premises. In the third figure, the middle term is the subject of both the premises. In the fourth figure, the middle term is made the predicate of the major and the subject of the minor premises.

23 Q.—How many possible modes of syllogisms are there, and what are their distinguishing characteristics ?

A.—There are 64 possible modes. But of these only 24 remain after the application of the six rules laid down above. But five of these 24 are *useless*, therefore there remain 19. But of these eleven are the *principal*.

24 Q.—How many of the legitimate modes are admissible under each figure? and how many legitimate conclusive modes are there?

A.—In the first figure 4, in the second 5, in the third 7, in the fourth 5; eleven of these modes are conclusive.

25 Q.—What is the difference between Ostensive reduction and *reducio ad impossibile*?

A.—By Ostensive reduction we reduce in the first figure a syllogism of any other figure (or what may be called improper mode), and draw a conclusion in the first figure which is *the same* as the conclusion in the other figure, or which is *implied* in the latter. By *reducio ad impossibile* we do not prove the truth of the conclusion *directly*, but prove in the first figure that the *contradictory* of the conclusion of an improper mood is *false*,—cannot be true.

26 Q.—What is a conditional syllogism?

A.—A conditional syllogism is that in which the major premise is *conditional*, thus:

If Cæsar were a tyrant, he deserved death (conditional.)

But Cæsar *was* a tyrant,

Therefore Cæsar deserved death.

27 Q.—What are the two rules applying to conditional propositions, and upon which conditional syllogisms are founded?

A.—These two rules are the following: I. If in the conditional proposition the first part or the *antecedent* be *true*, the last part or *consequent* must also be true. II. If the consequent be false, the antecedent must be false.

28 Q.—What are the two rules with regard to the validity of the conclusion which are to be observed in conditional syllogisms?

29 Q.—What is the difference between a conditional and a disjunctive syllogism?

A.—The definition of a conditional syllogism has already been given (Ans. 26.) A disjunctive syllogism is that in which one of the premises is a disjunctive proposition, thus:

This man is either a liar or a deceived person (disjunctive proposition.)

He is *not* a liar.

Therefore he is a deceived person.

30 Q.—Give an example of a disjunctive syllogism.

A.—(See Ans. 29.)

31 Q.—Show how the following hypothetical syllogism may be reduced to a categorical:

If the founder of Christianity and his followers passed their lives in labours, dangers and sufferings in attestation of the miraculous history contained in our scriptures, that history must be true.

But they did pass their lives in labours, dangers and sufferings in attestation of the History contained in our Scriptures.

Therefore, that history must be true.

A.—

The case of the founder of Christianity and his followers passing their lives in labours, dangers and sufferings in attestation of the miraculous history delivered in the Scriptures, is the case of that history's being true.

But the case of these men *is such*.

Therefore that history must be true.

32 Q.—Also the following :

If Mahometanism be true then sensuality and licentiousness are no evils.

But sensuality and licentiousness are evils.

Therefore Mahometanism is not true.

A.—

The case of Mahometanism being true is the case of licentiousness and sensuality being no evils.

But the case of sensuality and licentiousness being no evils is not true.

Therefore Mahometanism is not true.

33 Q.—What are the several kinds of irregular syllogisms ?

A.—Enthemyme, Sorites, Dilemma, Epichirema, Induction.

34 Q.—What are the several kinds of fallacies, and how are they distinguished from each other ?

A.—Three kinds : *logical fallacies, semi-logical and non-logical*. In logical fallacies the mistake is in the reasoning process ; in semi-logical partly in the reasoning process and partly in the meaning of terms ; in non-logical fallacies the mistake *is not at all* in the process of reasoning, but it is in the matter of the premises, in their truth.

35 Q.—What are the non-logical fallacies ?

A.—The non-logical fallacies are such as already defined (Ans. 34). They are three in number, *Non causa pro causa, Petitio principii, Ignoratio elenchi*.

36 Q.—If an argument be sound how is it possible to resolve it ?

A.—It may be resolved into the syllogistic form.

37 Q.—What are the two processes that take place in *induction* ?

A.—By one we bring in several cases together to see whether they all agree or not ; by the other we deduce some truth from these cases.

38 Q.—With which of these two has logic to do ?

A.—With the latter.

39 Q.—Show how the following induction may be thrown into the syllogistic form.

It has been found in the case of Europeans, Asiatics, Africans and Americans that they are all under the influence of sin. Hence we infer that all men are sinners.

A.—

Whatever is true in the case of Europeans, Asiatics, Africans and Americans is true in the case of all men.

But it is true that Europeans, &c. are sinners.

• Therefore all men are sinners.

40 Q.—Is Logic an instrument for the discovery of new truths?

A.—No. It is *no* instrument for the discovery of new truth.

41 Q.—What are “reasoning *a priori*, and reasoning *a posteriori*?”

A.—When we reason from cause to effect we reason *a priori*, when from effect to cause *a posteriori*.

42 Q.—Distinguish between Moral and Demonstrative reasoning.

A.—In Demonstrative reasoning one truth is *necessarily evolved out of, or follows* another; so *must* be. But *not* so in moral reasoning; it is probable reasoning, and admits of *degrees* of probability and of *accumulation* of evidence.

43 Q.—What are the two great divisions of evidence?

A.—Intuitive and Deductive evidence.

44 Q.—Which of the two branches is divided into moral and demonstrative?

A.—The Deductive evidence is *so* divided.

45 Q.—What are the three divisions of moral evidence?

A.—I. Evidence of Experience. II. Evidence from Analogy. III. Evidence from Testimony.

46 Q.—What are Bacon’s divisions of the “causes of error in judging and reasoning?”

A.—*Idola tribus, idola specus, idola fori, idola theatri.*

47 Q.—Specify and distinguish each of these.

A.—To the first class of these idols belong all those prejudices which have their root in the spiritual nature of man, so, *all men* have these prejudices. To the second class belong all those prejudices which men extract from the *peculiarities* in the circumstances of their life, from the education they receive, the companies they are bred in, &c. Just as a man coming out of a den will see the world with different eyes from one of us, so a man will do with regard to all truth *with idola specus*, compared with him who is *without idola specus*, if that were possible. Hence the name *idola specus* or *idols of the den*. To the third class belong all those prejudices arising from the ambiguity of terms and the different shades of their meaning. They are called *idola fori* or *idols of the market*, probably because such prejudices prevail especially in markets, or are derived specially from them. To the fourth class of Bacon’s idols belong all those prejudices which arise out of fashion, au-

thority, sectarian principles, &c. And they are called *idola theatri* or *idols of the theatre*, because they impose on persons in the same manner as the objects in the theatre do.

MENTAL PHILOSOPHY.

1 Q.—Define mind.

A.—The mind is that which conceives, judges, reasons, loves, hates, fears, hopes, joys, is grieved, &c.

2 Q.—How is the mind best to be known?

A.—The mind is best known by an internal observation of its phenomena, that is, its successive states of thought and feeling.

3 Q.—What object chiefly engaged the attention of the ancient philosophers?

A.—*Moral Philosophy*—or the Philosophy of man's duty, man's supreme good, and other great subjects relating to man's nature as a *moral being*, as capable of virtue or vice, happiness or misery,—engaged exclusively or rather almost exclusively the attention of the ancient philosophers.

4 Q.—How did the Indian philosophers propose to secure the supreme happiness of a being who is the victim of evil passions?

A.—The Indian philosophers proposed to secure the supreme felicity of man, who is the victim of evil passions, by rooting out, not by purifying, all passions and rendering man a passionless being.

5 Q.—Point out the superiority of the gospel method to theirs?

A.—The gospel does not propose to root out, i. e. annihilate these passions, but sanctifies them, giving to man the power to regulate his passions. Herein is the superiority of the gospel above the Indian Philosophy.

6 Q.—What is meant by Physiology of the Mind?

A.—By Physiology of the Mind is meant an inquiry into its successive states of thought and feeling, the circumstances which precede and follow them; in general, it is an inquiry into the phenomena of the mind, and the laws by which the phenomena are regulated.

7 Q.—In what two lights are we to regard the mental affections?

A.—The two lights in which we are to regard the mental affections are, first, the *nature* of these affections, secondly, their *use*.

8 Q.—When we have agreed as to a good end why must we especially attend to the selection of means for its accomplishment?

A.—When we have agreed as to a good end we must especially attend to the selection of means for its accomplishment, because if proper means be not provided for, the most benevolent end in view may turn out to be injurious and harmful.

9 Q.—Illustrate the necessity of this from the practical working of the poor laws of England.

A.—The ultimate end in view, which the framers of these poor laws had, was indeed benevolent, namely, to repress poverty in England ; but in endeavouring to do so by *law*, the poor people thought that they had a legal claim upon the rich, became therefore unconcerned about providing for themselves, became indolent, vicious. Their numbers increased rapidly, since marriages were fearlessly entered into,—the poor people knowing that if they were not able, the law would provide for their families. By the institution of these poor laws the sympathies and charities of the rich have been frozen, who give to the poor not through a feeling of charity, but through legal obligation. And the poor show no gratitude to the rich. And the number of paupers instead of decreasing, has immensely increased ; and vice and misery have followed in their train. Thus has the best end, by improper means, proved injurious and harmful. Hence the necessity of the selection of *proper* means.

10 Q.—Define the true philosophic spirit.

A.—The true philosophic spirit is that which seeks to know all things as far as they can be known, stops where it is impossible to know, hears all, judges all, accepts the truth, yet not triumphing over its foes, rejects error though supported by the most learned, and holds the truth even though the whole world should be against it.

11 Q.—What are the only real limits within which every science is comprehended ?

A.—The real limits within which every science is comprehended, are the *extent and power of our mental faculties*.

12 Q.—Is a right view of the mind antecedently *essential* to the cultivation of every other science ?

A.—A right view of the science of mind is *not essential* to the cultivation of any other science. But the study of mental science is important and desirable, since it is in many respects *essential* to *discovery* in other sciences.

13 Q.—Illustrate this subject.

A.—Take for example, the science of Physics. The science of the Mind is *not essential* to the science of Physics, since there are many scholars in the material department of Philosophy who have not even entered the mental department.

14 Q.—What is it which alone we can know either of matter or mind ?

A.—It is the phenomena, and these alone that we can know of matter or mind. Of the *essence* of matter and mind alike we are profoundly ignorant, we cannot possibly know any thing of it.

15 Q.—Apply this to expose the fallacy of objections respecting the essence or internal constitution of the God-head.

A.—If to know aught of the *essence* of our spirits, or even the

essence of gross matter around, our faculties fail, more than fail, lie prostrate in the dust, how foolish and vain are the attempts of those who with their insect powers go to fathom the essence, or the internal constitution of the God-head,—cavilling at the doctrines of the Bible, that unless they *fully understand how* three persons, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are in *One* God-head, they must reject the doctrine, by whatever accumulation of evidence it be established that God Himself has revealed the doctrine !

16 Q.—In what two different aspects ought matter to be viewed as the object of physical inquiry ?

A.—The two different aspects in which matter ought to be viewed as the object of physical inquiry, are, first, as matter exists *in space* ; secondly, as it exists *in time* ; that is, in the former case, our inquiry is, What is the *composition* of material objects, of what elements are they the compounds ; in the latter case, our inquiry is, What are the susceptibilities and powers of material objects, that is, what are the capabilities of *being affected* by other material objects, which capabilities are called *susceptibilities* ; and what the capacities of *affecting other* material objects, which capacities are called *powers* ; in general, in the latter case, what are the *changes* which material objects produce reciprocally upon each other.

17 Q.—Into what would Dr. Brown reduce all causation ?

A.—Dr. Brown's view of causation is this. He says that when an antecedent is followed by its consequent there is *nought between these*, no mysterious something called *power* which connects the antecedent with the consequent in respect of causation. One antecedent is followed by a consequent and followed *invariably* ; *this is all we can know*. We cannot go a step further, (for it would be unphilosophical to go,) than the mere *invariable antecedents* and the mere *invariable consequents*. And when it is asked *why* is one antecedent followed by one consequent rather than another consequent, the answer ought to be because God hath so ordered things. Dr. Brown's main aim was to banish all notion of a *mysterious something* called *power* which linked the antecedent with the consequent ; but in doing so he fails in one important point, namely, that cause is *more than mere* invariable antecedence, and effect *more than mere* invariable consequence. He forgot to bring clearly out that there is some peculiar *fitness*, some peculiar *aptitude*, which obtains between the antecedent and the consequent. I express humbly how I understand Brown on this point. His main aim was to *banish all notion* of *power* as a *mysterious something* which linked the antecedent with the consequent. There is *no such mysterious something* he has again and again attempted to prove. But in the vehemence of his argument to prove this, Dr. Brown seems to have forgotten to *bring clearly out* that pecu-

liar aptitude which obtains between the antecedent and the consequent, which makes each *fit* to be a part of *its own* train of sequences, and not of another. Herein is some weakness of the philosopher.

18 Q.—Show by example how cause is more than invariable antecedence.

A.—If causes were mere invariable antecedents then days would become causes of nights, one season of the year would become the cause of the following season; since both days are invariable antecedents of nights, and one season is the invariable antecedent of the succeeding season: wherefore cause is something more than mere invariable antecedence. There must be that peculiar aptitude referred to above, otherwise no causes, no effects are there.

19 Q.—If there be an aptitude in a cause to precede, and in an effect to follow, to what grand inference must this lead?

A.—The grand inference from this peculiar aptitude between cause and effect is, the being of a God. How else could be that aptitude? It is because a *fitter* or *designer* has *designed* and *fitted* antecedents and consequents to each other, that there is that peculiar aptitude. This fitter or designer is the Supreme Intelligence—God.

20 Q.—Of what can power be properly predicated?

A.—Power can be properly predicated of spirit alone.

21 Q.—Show how the term has been transferred to matter?

A.—The term power has been transferred to matter *analogically*, thus: My mind is conscious that it has volition, power; and it is also conscious that by this power it can effect some change; hence, when matter produces change on matter, the term power is transferred analogically to matter:—not that matter absolutely has any power, but that matter seems to produce changes in the same manner that my mind is conscious that its power can produce.

22 Q.—State and expose Mr. Hume's argument against the connection between cause and effect.

A.—Hume's argument against the connection between cause and effect is as follows: It is not necessary, says he, that any antecedent should be followed by its correspondent consequent and by no other consequent. There is no more necessity, for example, that fire would burn my hand than that it would cool my hand. Therefore, says the philosopher, there is no connection between cause and effect. But there is a fallacy that lurks in secret in the reasoning of this philosopher. True, there is no absolute necessity, that a set of antecedents would be followed by a correspondent set of consequents, and by this set alone and no other. True all that is said about fire. But though there is no absolute necessity, there is, none can deny, relative or actual necessity. Fire has never cooled, never does cool, never will cool, but for the interference of the Deity. But God might if He chose have endowed

fire with the property of cooling. Therefore we conclude, though there is no absolute necessity, just as Mr. Hume says, that one set of antecedents should be followed by one corresponding set of consequents, and by no other, yet there *is relative or created necessity* : that is, as long as the constitution of the universe remains the same, SO it *must* be. Therefore there *is* connection between causes and effects.

23 Q.—What is the true relation which the series of physical causes bears to the Supreme Efficiency?

A.—The true relation between the series of physical causes and God, the Supreme Efficiency, is that which subsists between a chain of successive pieces of machinery and the ultimate intelligence which gave form and motion to the whole. The relation between a watchmaker and a watch is the same as that which subsists between God and the series of physical causes which guide all the movements and operations of the universe.

24 Q.—Apply this for the purpose of defining a miracle.

A.—A miracle is an *effect* which has the *direct agency* of God for its *cause* ; not any physical cause, which in fact is an *instrumental cause*,—God himself being the ultimate efficient cause of all.

25 Q.—State how the philosophy of mind agrees with that of matter in the two species of inquiry which the latter admits.

A.—As the philosophy of matter, so the philosophy of the mind admits of two species of physical inquiry. For, in mind, just as in matter, we have to analyze compound mental phenomena, endeavouring to see of what *spiritual elements* may a phenomenon of the mind be compounded, which composition must be a spiritual composition, not like the gross composition of matter ; and in the second place, in mental philosophy, just as in the philosophy of matter, we inquire into the mental phenomena *as successive, as causes and effects*, following of course the laws of a *spiritual economy* .

26 Q.—Show in what sense the mind, though simple and indivisible, may exhibit seemingly complex feelings which admit of analysis.

A.—The mind though simple and indivisible does exhibit *seemingly* complex feelings. Remember, for example, your father whom through circumstances you have not seen for years ; at the very moment the image of your father is present to your mind, or your mind is in the state of conceiving your father, the mind at the same time melts within you with *filial affection and love*. Here conception co-exists with emotion, and the momentary feeling is a *complex* feeling, though the mind itself be simple and indivisible ; just as the simple glass reflects with the same ease, a variety of objects, with which it does one simple object. The complex feeling, complex in reference to *our* conception, is not such in

reference to the mind. The mind is simple, its states must therefore be simple ; *this state* is therefore simple in reference to the mind ; but it is *complex* in reference to *our conception*.

27 Q.—Define what is meant by the relation of mental equivalence or comprehensiveness.

A.—Mental equivalence or comprehensiveness is the relation which one feeling of the mind may be said to have in comprehending some other mental feelings : comprehending *not* in the sense in which matter comprehends matter ; but the comprehensiveness in the case of the mind is *virtual* ; it is *relative to our conception*. Imagine, for example, a golden tree on the banks of a pearly river : here the feeling of the mind in conceiving the golden tree in reference to the *mind itself* is simple ; but the same feeling in reference to *our conception* may be said to be *equal to* or *comprehend in* it two other simple feelings, namely, the conception of a tree, and the conception of gold. The equivalence therefore is *virtual*, it is in reference to our conception.

28 Q.—On what does all classification depend ?

A.—All classification depends upon the relation of *agreement* or *disagreement* which bodies have to one another in certain properties.

29 Q.—State the two great leading divisions of mental phenomena which have met with the most general adoption by philosophers.

A.—The two great divisions of mental phenomena which have met with the most general adoption by philosophers, are *first*, the division of the mental phenomena into those of the understanding and the will ; *secondly*, the division of the mental phenomena into the intellectual and active powers.

30 Q.—Point out the objections to these divisions.

A.—Both these divisions are inaccurate and incomplete. For, in the former, the phenomena of the *will* are *not a separate class* of mental phenomena ; *will*, on the contrary, is a master faculty of the soul, presiding, as it were, over all the phenomena of the mind ;—further there are many phenomena of the mind which are left out in this division, such as, love, hatred, joy, grief, astonishment, &c. Now, *these latter* are *as much* phenomena of the *will* as imagination, judgment, called in this division powers of the understanding. Therefore, the division is both *inaccurate* and *incomplete*. In reference to the latter division it may be said that all powers of the mind are more or less *active*. Surely when Newton evolved out of his mind the *Principia*, his mind was active. But the judging and reasoning faculties of the mind according to this division are no active powers. Again, grief, astonishment and such others can belong neither to the intellectual nor to the active powers. Therefore, the division is both *inaccurate* and *incomplete*.

31 Q.—What is the advantage of a new division even if imperfect?

A.—The advantage of a new division even if imperfect is the following: those relations of objects which were *neglected*, when the objects were considered in reference to a former division, are by a new division, though imperfect, clearly brought out.

32 Q.—What amount of information could we originally have received from smell, taste and hearing?

A.—The amount of information which our senses of smell, tasting and hearing could originally have given us, is the same that our consciousnesses of joy, sorrow, would have given us; that is, neither the former, nor the latter could of themselves have given us any evidence of an *external universe*. We would have, in this case, the information only of *our consciousnesses*.

33 Q.—Show how these at present communicate more important informations.

A.—The senses of smell, taste and hearing do *now* give us *much important* information. We now ascribe the rise of certain sensations, through their respective organs, to certain qualities of matter which we could not have done originally. For example, we hear the sound of a flute, and we ascribe the sound immediately to the instrument called flute, and we can tell also in many cases the exact quarter whence the sound comes. This we are enabled to do by *association of ideas*. *Former experience* combined with *association of ideas* gives me this knowledge. The case is the same with all the senses of hearing, taste and smell.

34 Q.—State the hypothesis of the elder Platonists regarding perception.

A.—The hypothesis of the elder Platonists regarding perception is the following: They thought ideas to be real actual entities, archetypes of the visible creation, existing from all eternity in the mind of God. Men *see only these ideas* when they say that they form ideas in the mind.

35 Q.—State that of the Peripatetics.

A.—The hypothesis of the Peripatetics is the following: They thought that objects threw off certain filmy images, which entering through the organs of sense, were afterwards intellectualized and deposited in the mind as intellectual species. These were ideas.

36 Q.—What difficulty may have suggested the Peripatetic hypothesis?

A.—The difficulty which they felt in understanding how mind can *affect* or *be affected by* matter, and that in the perception of *distant* objects, very probably suggested their wild hypothesis.

37 Q.—State and expose the opinion of DesCartes regarding perception.

A.—DesCartes thought that we did not perceive the ob-

jects themselves ; but that at the very moment that the objects were before us, they became the *occasions* on which God by His almighty power infused certain ideas in our mind. This has many objections. For, if so, how could we have been conscious of a material universe ? This opinion of DesCartes also derogates from the wisdom of God. For instead of making Him an all-intelligent Contriver, as he really is, infinitely better than the watchmaker, the hypothesis makes Him sit behind the material universe, and move *directly*, without the intervention of any instrumental causes, all its movements. Moreover, if this hypothesis were true, there could be no miracles. Lastly it has no *proof*, it is a mere hypothesis.

38 Q.—State and expose that of Berkeley.

A.—The end which led Berkeley to form his strange hypothesis was a pious one. This end was to prove the existence of an Omnipresent Spirit. His demonstration runs thus. He first proved that *ideas* were *separate* from the *objects* of which they were the ideas. Then, said he, these ideas must be *somewhere*, (taking for granted that ideas are some entities which require a place to dwell in). These ideas cannot dwell in matter ; they *must* dwell in mind. But, said he, these ideas existed before my birth, they are *not continually* present to my mind ; they will exist after my death ; all men in all quarters of the world have these ideas ;—therefore, there must be one great Omnipresent Spirit in whom these ideas dwell. The *reasoning* of Berkeley is correct ; he only took one thing for granted ; namely, that ideas are some entities which require a place to dwell in ; and only because of this he fell into error. The doctrine of Berkeley, moreover, is contrary to experience. Our belief of an external universe depends upon principles of belief far stronger than logical reasoning.

39 Q.————— that of Malebranche.

A.—Malebranche thought that we did not perceive objects, but the *ideas of them which are in the mind of God*. This doctrine is without proof. It materializes the mind of God, and thus degrades Him. It is contrary to universal consciousness.

40 Q.————— that of Leibnitz.

A.—Leibnitz had his theory of *pre-established harmony*. He said there is *no* connection between matter and spirit. A series of material phenomena was pre-established by God, as well as a series of mental phenomena. These two series are *quite independent* of each other. But by *pre-established harmony* their several parts *correspond* with each other ; yet each is independent of the other. If Leibnitz's doctrine be true, then we have no proof of an *external world*. Further, it has *no* proof.

ALGEBRA.

1 Q.—Solve the following equation by all the three methods.

$$\text{Given } \begin{cases} \frac{2x}{3} + 5y = 23 \\ 5x + \frac{7y}{4} = -6\frac{1}{4} \end{cases} \text{ to find the values of } x \text{ and } y.$$

A.—

First method.

$$\frac{2x}{3} + 5y = 23$$

$$\therefore 2x + 15y = 69$$

$$\text{also } \therefore \begin{aligned} 15y &= 69 - 2x \\ y &= \frac{69 - 2x}{15} \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $\frac{69 - 2x}{15}$ for the value of y in the second equation,

$$\text{we have } 5x + \frac{7\left(\frac{69 - 2x}{15}\right)}{4} = -6\frac{1}{4}$$

multiplying by 4,

$$20x + 7\left(\frac{69 - 2x}{15}\right) = -25$$

$$\text{or, } 20x + \frac{483 - 14x}{15} = -25$$

multiplying by 15,

$$300x + 483 - 14x = -375$$

$$\therefore 286x = -375 - 483 = -858$$

$$x = \frac{-858}{286} = -3$$

Again

$$\frac{2x}{3} + 5y = 23$$

$$\therefore \frac{-6}{3} + 5y = 23$$

$$\text{or } -2 + 5y = 23$$

$$\therefore 5y = 23 + 2 = 25$$

$$\therefore y = \frac{25}{5} = 5.$$

Second method.

$$\frac{2x}{3} + 5y = 23$$

multiplying by 3, $2x + 15y = 69$

$$\therefore x = \frac{69 - 15y}{2}$$

$$\text{Again } 5x + \frac{7y}{4} = -6\frac{1}{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\therefore 20x + 7y &= -25 \\ 20x &= -7y - 25 \\ x &= \frac{-7y - 25}{20}\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Wherefore } \frac{69 - 15y}{2} = \frac{-7y - 25}{20}$$

Multiplying by 2,

$$69 - 15y = \frac{-14y - 50}{20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\therefore 1380 - 300y &= -14y - 50 \\ \text{Transposing } 1380 + 50 &= -14y + 300y = 286y \\ \text{or, } 1430 &= 286y\end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore y = \frac{1430}{286} = 5$$

$$\text{Again } 5x + \frac{7y}{4} = -6\frac{1}{4}$$

Substituting the value of y , we have

$$5x + \frac{35}{4} = -6\frac{1}{4}$$

Multiplying by 4,

$$\begin{aligned}20x + 35 &= -25 \\ \therefore 20x &= -60 \\ \therefore x &= -3\end{aligned}$$

Third method.

$$\frac{2x}{3} + 5y = 23$$

Multiplying by 3,

$$2x + 15y = 69$$

$$\text{Also the second equation } 5x + \frac{7y}{4} = -6\frac{1}{4}$$

Multiply by 4,

$$20x + 7y = -25$$

The above equation was $2x + 15y = 69$

Multiply this by 10,

$$20x + 150y = 690$$

The former was $20x + 7y = -25$

Perform subtraction $143 y = 715$

$$y = \frac{715}{143} = 5$$

$$\text{But } \frac{2x}{3} + 5y = 23$$

Substituting the value of y , we have

$$\frac{2x}{3} + 25 = 23$$

Multiply by 3, $2x + 75 = 69$

$$2x = 69 - 75 = -6$$

$$x = -3$$

2 Q.—State the *common rule* for preparing and solving an affected quadratic.

*A.—Add the square of half the coefficient of the second term of the first side of the equation to both sides of the equation. Then find the square root of the first side, which is done easily, thus x or the unknown quantity may immediately be found.

3 Q.—State the *Hindu rule* for preparing and solving an affected quadratic.

*A.—Multiply both sides of the equation by 4 times the coefficient of the first term of the first side : add to both sides the square of the coefficient of the second term of the first side : then go on as in the former case.

†4 Q.—Solve the following equation by the common rule.

$$\text{Given } \sqrt{4 + \sqrt{2x^2 + x^2}} = \frac{x+4}{2} \text{ to find the values of } x. \quad \left. \vphantom{\sqrt{4 + \sqrt{2x^2 + x^2}}} \right\}$$

†5 Q.—Solve the following question by the Hindu rule.

$$\text{Given } \sqrt{x+12} = \frac{12}{\sqrt{x+5}} \text{ to find the values of } x.$$

6 Q.—Expand $(a+2x)^{-3}$ to six terms.

$$\begin{aligned} A. &-(a+2x)^{-3} = a^{-3} + (-3) 2 a^{-4} x + \left(\frac{(-3) \cdot (-4)}{2} \right) \\ &4 a^{-5} x^2 + \left(\frac{(-3) \cdot (-4) \cdot (-5)}{1 \cdot 2 \cdot 3} \right) 8 a^{-6} x^3 \\ &+ \left(\frac{(-3) \cdot (-4) \cdot (-5) \cdot (-6)}{1 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 4} \right) 16 a^{-7} x^4 \\ &+ \left(\frac{(-3) \cdot (-4) \cdot (-5) \cdot (-6) \cdot (-7)}{1 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 4 \cdot 5} \right) 32 a^{-8} x^5 \end{aligned}$$

* These answers are defective.

† The 4th and 5th questions, being regarded as of easy solution, were postponed till the 6th and 7th were solved. Meanwhile, the given time having elapsed, the competition was closed.

$$= a^{-3} - 6 a^{-4} x + 24 a^{-5} x^2 - 80 a^{-6} x^3 + 240 a^{-7} x^4 \\ - 672 a^{-8} x^5$$

7 Q.—The logarithm of 4 being = .6020600, and 2 M being = .86858896, required the log. of 5 calculated to seven places of figures.

$$A.—\text{Log. } (P + 1) = 2 M \left(\frac{1}{2 P + 1} + \frac{1}{3 (2 P + 1)^3} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{5 (2 P + 1)^5} \&c. \right) + \text{Log. } P$$

$$P = 4, \text{ and Log. } 4 = .6020600$$

$$\therefore \text{Log. } (4 + 1) = 2 M \left(\frac{1}{9} + \frac{1}{3 \cdot (9)^3} + \frac{1}{5 \cdot (9)^5} \&c. \right) \\ + .6020600$$

$$2 M = .86858896$$

$$\text{Now } \frac{1}{9} = .1; \text{ and } \frac{1}{3 (9)^3} = \frac{1}{2187}; \text{ and } \frac{1}{5 (9)^5} = \frac{1}{295245}$$

$$\therefore \text{Again } 1. = .1111111$$

$$\text{and } \frac{1}{2187} = .0004572$$

$$\text{and } \frac{1}{295245} = .0000033$$

$$\text{Adding, we have } .1115716$$

Also, multiplying .1115716 by .86858896, we have the product = .096909950009536

$$\text{Add log. } 4 = .6020600$$

$$\text{Logarithm of } 5 = .6989699$$

GEOMETRY AND TRIGONOMETRY.

1 Q.—If two triangles have two sides of the one equal respectively to two sides of the other, and have those angles equal which are apposite to two of the equal sides, and have those angles which are opposite to the other two equal sides either both acute or both obtuse, the triangles shall be equal in every respect, and have those angles equal which are opposite to equal sides.

A.—Let there be two Δ s. ABC, DEF, (see fig. 1) having the sides and angles respectively equal as marked in the figure; then they are equal in every respect.

PROOF.

Because $AB = DE$; and $AC = DF$, therefore $AB : AC = DE : DF$; but the $\angle ACB = \angle DFE$ in the Δ s. ABC, DEF , and also the \angle s. ABC, DEF are *both* either acute or obtuse, therefore it follows directly from the 7th prop. of B. VI. that these two triangles are equiangular and therefore similar.

Consequently the $\angle BAC = \angle EDF$; and applying the 4th prop. of B. I. we prove the Δ s. equal in every respect.

2 Q.—If the three sides of one triangle be perpendicular respectively to the three sides of another, the two triangles are similar, and the sides which are perpendicular to one another are opposite to equal angles.

A.—Let the three sides of the ΔKLN (see fig. 2) be perpendicular to the three sides of the ΔAOR ; each to each, namely LN perpendicular to AR ; NK to AO ; and LK to OR produced; then these Δ s. are similar, and KN and AO , KL and OR , and NL and AR are homologous sides.

Produce KO to Z .

Now the $\angle AOR =$ the sum of the \angle s. $KXO, XKO =$ the sum of a rt. \angle and the $\angle XKO =$ the sum of the \angle s. $NKZ, XKO =$ the $\angle NKL$.

Again the $\angle NKZ$ is a rt. \angle

\therefore the sum of the \angle s. $KNZ, NZK =$ one rt. $\angle = \angle ANZ$; take the common part the angle KNZ from both, then the remaining $\angle NZK =$ the remaining $\angle ANK$;

but the $\angle AKN$ of the ΔANK is $=$ the $\angle NKZ$ of the ΔNKZ ,

\therefore (by 32 prop. of B. I. with 3 Ax.) $\angle KAN = \angle KNL$; but $\angle AOR$ was proved $= \angle NKL$

$\therefore \angle ARO = \angle NLK$

\therefore the Δ s. AOR, NKL are *equiangular*,

\therefore similar,

$\therefore AO : OR = NK : KL$

$OR : AR = KL : LN$

AO and KN, OR and KL, AR and LN are homologous sides.

Q. E. D.

3 Q.—Triangles or parallelograms of equal bases are to one another as their altitudes.

A.—The Δ s. OPQ, RQS (see fig. 3) stand upon equal bases PQ, QS ; it can be proved that the $\Delta OPQ : \text{the } \Delta RQS = \text{the altitude of } \Delta OPQ : \text{alt. of } \Delta RQS$.

Through the points R, O draw RV, OU parallel to PS ; draw the perpendicular SUV ; and join VQ and UQ .

$\Delta OPQ = \Delta UQS$
 $\Delta RQS = \Delta VQS$ } 38 prop. of B. I.

But $\Delta UQS : \Delta VQS = US : SV$ (by 1 prop. of B. VI.)

Now, US is the alt. of ΔOPQ , and SV is the alt. of ΔRQS .

$\therefore \Delta OPQ : \Delta RQS = \Delta UQS : \Delta VQS =$ the alt. of ΔOPQ : the alt. of ΔRQS and $2 \Delta OPQ : 2 \Delta RQS =$ the alt. of ΔOPQ : the alt. of the ΔRQS (answering to the case of parallelograms) Q. E. D.

4 Q.—The perimeters of similar polygons are proportional to their corresponding sides.

A.—(See fig. 4) $a + b + c + d + e + x : f + g + h + k + l + y = a : f = b : g = c : h$, &c.

By supposition $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} a : b = f : g \\ c : d = h : k \end{array} \right\}$

\therefore (by 24 of B. V.) $a + c : b = f + h : g$

$a + c + b : b = f + h + g : g$, *componendo*.

$a + c + b : f + h + g = b : g = c : h = d : k$ (alternando and supposition)

$a + c + b : d = f + h + g : k$, *alternando*.

$a + c + b + d : d = f + h + g + k : k$, *componendo*.

$a + c + b + d : f + h + g + k = d : k = e : l$ (alternando and supposition)

$a + c + b + d : e = f + h + g + k : l$, *alternando*.

$a + c + b + d + e : e = f + h + g + k + l : l$, *componendo*.

$a + c + b + d + e : f + h + g + k + l = e : l = x : y$

$a + c + b + d + e : x = f + h + g + k + l : y$, *alternando*.

$a + c + b + d + e + x : x = f + h + g + k + l + y : y$, *componendo*.

$a + c + b + d + e + x : f + h + g + k + l + y = x : y = e : l = d : k$, &c. &c. Q. E. D.

5 Q.—The area of a regular polygon is = the perimeter multiplied by half the perpendicular from the centre upon one of the sides.

A.—A regular polygon may be divided into as many equal triangles as it has sides. Now the area of a triangle is equal to the rectangle under the base and half the altitude; and in this case, it is equal to the rectangle under the base and half the perpendicular drawn from the centre. (See fig. 5)

Let half the perpendicular = a

Perimeter = p

A side of the polygon = b

Area of a triangle made within the polygon (such as, $ox y$) equal to each of the other triangles made in the same manner = x

Area of the polygon = y

$$b a = x$$

Multiplying by n , $n b a = n x$

$$\text{or } (n b) a = n x$$

Here $n x$ is the area of the polygon; $n b$ the perimeter, and a half the line drawn from the centre to one of the sides. Q. E. D.

**Problems.*

6 Q.—To divide a circle into any number (say 4) equal parts by means of concentric circles.

7 Q.—From a given point in the side of a triangle to draw a straight line, which shall halve the triangle.

8 Q.—To inscribe a square in a given triangle.

9 Q.—Three sides of a triangle being given, required a rule for finding by calculation, the radius of the circle inscribed within the triangle.

10 Q.—State the method of finding the distances between three objects and a fourth, when the distances of the three objects from each other, and the angles which these distances subtend at a fourth are given.

11 Q.—The diameters D and d of two concentric circles being given, required an expression for the area of the annulus enclosed between them.

12 Q.—Required an expression for the same when the circumferences C and c are given.

CONIC SECTIONS.

1 Q.—Define the parameter in each of the Conic Sections.

A.—In a parabola, the parameter of any diameter is four times the distance of the vertex of that diameter from the directrix. Both in the ellipse and the hyperbola, the parameter of any diameter is a third proportional between that diameter and its conjugate diameter.

2 Q.—Prove, that if from the vertex of any diameter of a parabola, a straight line be drawn to the extremity of an ordinate meeting another ordinate, the latter will be a mean proportional between its segment next the diameter and the former.

A.—(See fig. 6) $RP : SQ = SQ : TQ$

The Δ s. ORP , OTQ are evidently similar.

$$\therefore RP : TQ = PO : QO$$

$$\text{But } PO : QO = RP^2 : SQ^2 \text{ (cor. of 6 prop. of Par.)}$$

$$\therefore RP : TQ = RP^2 : SQ^2$$

Therefore $RP : SQ = SQ : TQ$ (by cor. of 20 prop. of B. VI. of Euclid.) Q. E. D.

3 Q.—If a chord pass through one of the foci of an ellipse, and the tangents at its extremities be produced to meet, the straight line that joins the focus with the point where the tangents meet is perpendicular to the chord.

4 Q.—The square of any semidiameter of a hyperbola is equal to the rectangle under the distances of its vertex from the foci, added to the difference of the squares of the semi-transverse and semi-conjugate axes.

* The competition closed before the successful competitor had attempted the solution of any of these seven problems.

STATICS.

1 Q.—Enunciate the general proposition of the lever.

A.—The force, multiplied by the distance from the fulcrum, multiplied by the sine of the angle of direction in which the force acts, is always the same; whether the lever be bent or straight, whether the force act perpendicularly or not. If the force act perpendicularly, then the force multiplied by the distance from the fulcrum is always the same.

2 Q.—Describe the three kinds of straight levers.

A.—The first kind of straight lever is that in which the fulcrum is between the power and the weight. (See fig. 16.)

The second kind is that in which the weight is between the fulcrum and the power.

The third kind is that in which the power is between the weight and the fulcrum.

3 Q.—Describe the three systems of pulleys.

A.—(See fig. 7.) In the first system of pulleys, they are hung by parallel strings tied to one beam.

In the second system, AB is one beam *fixed*, CD another *moveable*; *a b, c, d*, are four pulleys. And a string is carried round PADBCn. The strings AD, DB, BC, Cn are all parallel.

The third system is the first system reversed.

*4 Q.—Three forces each equal to 120 lbs. act upon a point, making angles with each other of 45° each.—Required the magnitude of their resultant.

A.—(See fig. 8) Now BAD is a right angle. If the force AC did not exist, the resultant of AB and AD would have been the diameter of the square of AB; since $AB=AD$ by hypothesis. But even if AC did exist, it will not alter the *direction of their resultant*, but it will alter its magnitude. The magnitude of the resultant of AB and AD as altered by AC will = (diameter of AB^2) + AC^2 :—

therefore a force = $\sqrt{AB^2 + AD^2} + AB$ in the direction of AC will produce the same effect as AB, AC, AD in the supposed circumstances.

$\sqrt{AB^2 + AD^2} + AB$ is just $\sqrt{2 AB^2} + AB$; for $AB = AD$.

*5 Q.—A body in one scale of an unequal balance is counterpoised by 36 lbs. and in the other by 32 lbs.—what is its weight?

A.—(See fig. 9.) Let any weight x on the scale G be counterpoised by 36 lbs. and on the scale H by 32 lbs.

$$x \cdot BF = AF \cdot 36 \text{ lbs.}$$

$$x \cdot AF = BF \cdot 32 \text{ lbs.}$$

* These questions are not solved numerically but put into such forms that numerical Solutions can be very easily found.

6 Q.—A weight of 150 lbs. is supported by 4 pulleys (supposed without weight) arranged according to the first system—required the power supporting it.

$$\begin{aligned} A.— & P : W = 1 : 2^n ; n \text{ here} = 4 \\ & \therefore P : 150 \text{ lbs.} = 1 : 2^4 = 1 : 16 \\ & \therefore 16 P = 150 \text{ lbs.} \\ & P = \frac{150}{16} = 9 \frac{6}{16} \text{ lbs.} \end{aligned}$$

OPTICS.

1 Q.—What is light ?

A.—Light is something which makes objects *visible* ; whether it be matter or not, has not yet been ascertained.

2 Q.—What is the velocity of light ?

A.—About 192,000 miles in a second.

3 Q.—Explain in a general way with or without a diagram how the velocity of light was first ascertained and calculated.

A.—The velocity of light was first ascertained and calculated by the eclipses of Jupiter's satellites. The eclipses of these satellites *were calculated* with precision ; but they were *seldom seen* at the *calculated moments* : the moments when they were seen differed from these calculated moments *variously*, the greatest amount of variation being 16 minutes. Hence it was supposed, this was owing to light's traversing the axis of the earth's orbit in 16 minutes. According to the hypothesis, calculations were made for the passage of light when Jupiter was in other situations than conjunction and opposition. This hypothesis was corroborated by fact. And it was ascertained that light traversed the radius of the earth's orbit which is about 95,000,000 miles in eight minutes.

4 Q.—Of what does Catoptrics treat ?

A.—Of the *reflection* of light.

5 Q.—What is the general law of incidence and reflection ?

A.—The angle of incidence is equal to the angle of reflection.

6 Q.—When parallel rays fall upon a concave mirror how will they be reflected ?

A.—They will be reflected to a point half-way between the centre and the mirror.

7 Q.—To what grand practical purpose has this optical fact or law been turned ?

A.—The lights in light-houses are made according to this principle.

8 Q.—What is meant by the conjugate foci ?

A.—The radiant point and the focus where the rays after suffering reflection are concentrated are called the conjugate foci; (see fig. 10) thus A and F are conjugate foci.

9 Q.—How may the conjugate focal distance for diverging rays be found?

A.—The radius of the mirror's concavity and the distance of the radiant point from the mirror being given: multiply these two together, divide the product by the difference between twice the distance of the radiant point and the radius; the quotient will be the focal distance required.

10 Q.—What kind of images is formed by concave and convex mirrors?

A.—In convex mirrors, the images are *smaller* than the objects, and are seen at a distance *behind* the mirror *less* than the distance of the objects before the mirror: and when the object is brought on the surface of the mirror, the image is equal to the object. In concave mirrors, if the object be within the focal distance (the distance of the focus nearer to the mirror) the image is larger than the object. If otherwise, no image is seen *behind* the mirror, but *before* it; suspended as it were in air.

11 Q.—What is Dioptries?

A.—Dioptries treats of the *refraction* of light.

12 Q.—What is meant by the constant ratio of the sines?

A.—The constant ratio of the sines means the *same* ratio which the sines of two varying angles always have.

13 Q.—What is meant by the index of refraction?

A.—The index of refraction is the sine of the angle of refraction in relation to the sine of the angle of incidence.

14 Q.—Show how the difference in the refractive powers of bodies will explain the superior brilliancy of the diamond.

A.—In the diamond the index of refraction being 2.5, the greater part of the light instead of passing *through* will be *reflected*, hence its brilliancy.

15 Q.—When will the light falling on the second surface of a transparent body be wholly reflected and not a single ray suffer refraction?

A.—(See fig. 11.) Let GD a ray fall upon AC very obliquely, and let the index of refraction be great. Then DF will fall in a very oblique direction upon BC, and DFC being small, and refraction also being great, FH will not fall below BC, but above it. Thus light instead of being *refracted* will be *reflected*.

16 Q.—Apply this to the construction of the Camera Lucida.

A.—Any object being placed before AC (see last fig.), the rays of light will be reflected in the direction FH before EB, and the image of the object will be formed below at K. And taking a piece of white paper and a pencil, you can take the image upon the paper: the pencil of course will move according to the image.

ASTRONOMY.*

1 Q.—What are the different ways by which the place of a star may be ascertained and marked off on a globe?

A.—The different ways by which the place of a star may be ascertained and marked on the globe, are, first, by taking its declination and right ascension; secondly, by taking its latitude and longitude.—We can also ascertain the place of a star by taking its altitude and azimuth.

2 Q.—What is azimuth?

A.—The azimuth distance of a heavenly body is its angular distance from the north or south point as measured on the horizon.

3 Q.—What kind of spheroid is the earth, and how has its shape been ascertained?

A.—The earth is an oblate spheroid. And this has been ascertained by the fact, that a degree of latitude towards the poles has a greater number of miles than a degree of latitude towards the equator. Also it has been observed that a body is heavier near the poles than when it is near the equator, owing to the radius of the earth's being smaller at the poles than at the equator.

4 Q.—What is aberration, and what is its greatest amount?

A.—Aberration is caused by the *motion* of the earth when it is illumined by the rays of the sun.

5 Q.—How is the vernier constructed?

A.—The vernier is constructed on the principle of *proportion*. Thus, let AB (see fig. 15) be divided into eleven equal parts, and CD which is equal to AB into twelve. The difference between one-twelfth of CD and one-eleventh of AB is equal to one-eleventh of Ca. AB may be supposed a vernier, and CD the limb of a sextant or circle, &c.

6 Q.—What is the index-error of a sextant?

A.—The index-error is the deviation from parallelism between the plane of the horizon-glass and the index of the sextant pointing to O' on the graduated limb.

7 Q.—Find it for this day by observation?

A.—Read off 34' 15", read on 28' 45"; half the difference $\frac{5' 30''}{2} = 2' 45''$ observed.

8 Q.—How is a lunar observation to be taken with one sextant?

A.—Take any star for reference, Sirius for example. Find the altitude of Sirius; then alt. of C; then take thrice the angular distance between Sirius and D; then take the alt. of D, and again the alt. of Sirius.

* NOTE. In these answers, especially in the calculations, several errors, arising from haste, will be observed—but they are left uncorrected as they stood in the original.

9 Q.—How with three?

A.—Three persons at the same time hold their instruments. The one takes the alt. of \odot ; the other of a star; and the third the angular distance between the moon and the star. The *precise moments*, when their observations are taken, are noted by a person provided with a watch. The object is that these three observers should observe precisely at the same moment. This being impossible by one observation, observations are repeated by each observer, and the *means* are taken.

10 Q.—In the following observation, find the error of the watch from mean and from apparent time.

19th February 1840. Lat. $17^{\circ} 56'$ north. Long. $87^{\circ} 50'$ east. Time 8 hours $22' 32''$ A. M. Height of the eye 17 feet. Alt. of the sun's lower limb $25^{\circ} 24'$ at sea.

A.—

Altitude of \odot 's lower limb =

$25^{\circ} 24'$

— $3' 57''$ dip of the horz. for 17 feet.

$25^{\circ} 20' 3''$

+ $16' 11''.6$ \odot 's $\frac{1}{2}$ diam.

Take $25^{\circ} 36' 14''.6$ from

90°

$64^{\circ} 23' 46''$, which is the zenith distance.

Sun's decl. south $11^{\circ} 29' 34''.2$

+ Lat. north $17^{\circ} 56'$

$29^{\circ} 25' 34''.2$

Zenith distance $64^{\circ} 23' 46''$

Sum $93^{\circ} 49' 20''$ half = $46^{\circ} 54' 40''$

Difference $34^{\circ} 58' 12''$ half = $17^{\circ} 29' 6''$

Log. secant of $17^{\circ} 56' = 10.021630$

Log. secant of $11^{\circ} 29' 34'' = 10.008792$

Log. sine of $46^{\circ} 54' 40'' = 9.834460$

Log. sine of $17^{\circ} 29' 6'' = 9.477741$

Adding together, we have 39.342623

Rejecting tens we have

Log. 9.342623

will be equal to the apparent time from the nearest noon.

11 Q.—Find the latitude for to-day by the following meridian altitude: double alt. $89^{\circ} 28'$.

A.—

	89°	28'	
Index-error	2'	45''	
	<hr/>		
	2)89°	30' 45''	
	<hr/>		
	44°	45' 22''.5	(
		+ 16' 17''.2	
	<hr/>		
(subtract)	45°	1' 39''.7	true alt. of ☉'s centre.
(from)	90°		
	<hr/>		
North	44°	58' 20''.3	zenith distance.
	22°	23' 56''	- decl. of ☉ at Greenwich.
			22° 21' 56''.7 south.
	<hr/>		
	22° 34' 24''.3		
(Omitted)	Add diff. of Difference for 1 hour 19''.9 or 20''		
	ref. and par. 52''	} Multiply by 6	
Lat. 22°	35' 16''.3	} 60)120'(2'	
	W. S. M.		

Wherefore,

S. decli. of the sun at Calcutta

22° 23' 56'' nearly.

12 Q.—What is the equation of time, and when is it greatest?

A.—The sun does not come to the meridian at twelve exactly (except when it is in the either equinox or solistitial point). Twelve on the clock is the *mean* time when the sun comes to the meridian. In order to get *apparent noon from the mean noon* we have *something to add to or subtract from the mean noon*. Tables determining this quantity for every day of the year are tables of the equation of time. It is greatest when the sun is *half-way* between either equinox and either solistitial point on the ecliptic; i. e. when the sun is 45° distant either way from either equinox. This will happen four times in a year.

13 Q.—What are Kepler's laws?

A.—Kepler's laws are three in number. I. That the radius vector of the orbit of each planet describes *equal areas in equal times*. II. That the planets describe *ellipses*. III. That the *squares* of the *periodic times* of the planets vary directly as the *cubes* of their *mean distances*.

14 Q.—A short account of the Ptolemaic theory.

A.—Ptolemy supposed the earth to be the centre of the planetary sytem; and the sun and the planets move in their orbits round the earth as the centre: (see fig. 12) first the moon, next Mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn. Moreover, in order to account for the retrograde motions of the planets and

other peculiarities in their motions, he supposed them to move in *Epicycles*, the centre of which was always in the *Deferents*. These epicycles, he said, were crystalline globes, and these were fixed in the crystalline shells of the deferents. Beyond these was the starry vault which moved round the earth as the centre in 24 hours.

15 Q.—How does a transit differ from an eclipse?

A.—The transit truly speaking is a small eclipse. When Mercury and Venus pass over the disc of the sun, and make dark spots, we call these to be *transits* of Mercury and Venus. But if they covered any considerable portion of the sun's disc, we would have called them eclipses.

16 Q.—Describe the apparent motions of a planet, and explain them on the Copernican theory.

A.—A planet once moves *directly* in its revolution, then stops and becomes stationary for some time, next moves back or retrogrades, then changes its retrograde for direct motion. The direct motion on the whole more than counterbalances the retrograde. And in such a manner it makes its tour of the heavens, (figure 13 will represent it.) They *can* be explained by the Copernican theory. Take, for example, Jupiter, (see fig. 14.) As the earth is moving in its orbit in the direction of the arrow, so Jupiter in its orbit but with different velocity. When by Jupiter is marked O, then its motion as seen by us, or its apparent motion, will be direct; when by it is marked ♄, retrograde or stationary. This will appear by referring Jupiter to the sphere of the heavens. By the Copernican theory it is easy to explain all the irregularities of the motions of all the planets; especially of Mercury and Venus,

18 Q.—Write all you know about Jupiter.

A.—Jupiter is the largest of the planets. It is about 490,000,000 miles distant from the sun. It makes its tour round the heavens in about 12 years. It has four satellites. By the eclipses of these satellites the velocity of light has been ascertained. They are of immense value in also determining the longitude. When seen through the telescope, parallel belts are seen on its disc. Its disc is not exactly round. In the sky it is the brightest star except Venus.

D.

N. B.—The subject of the Essay from which the following extracts are taken was proposed by A. Beattie, Esq., who liberally offered a prize of fifty rupees to the successful competitor. The title was “On the Influence of sound general knowledge on Hinduism.” The Author, in his Essay, took a comprehensive survey of all the leading departments of general knowledge; and clearly shewed how, in all of them, Hinduism abounds with errors; and how the inevitable influence of sound knowledge must be destructive of Hinduism. The part now given, as a specimen, is selected merely because the topic is not familiar to most readers, and has therefore about it more of the air of novelty.

“But it is for Metaphysics that the learned of Hindustán have peculiarly distinguished themselves. Metaphysics is a science of a very strange nature. There is a short way that we can safely pass through in Metaphysical inquiries. But we soon come to the outer boundary which our limited faculties cannot pass. Without that boundary the more we attempt to walk, the more hopeless, and more hopeless proves our attempt. We cannot speak with certainty of aught that lies beyond it. But it may be said, the case is the same in every science; in every science there is a boundary line beyond which the utmost faculties of man can make no excursions. True, but it is peculiarly so in Metaphysics. It seems to us as if in this science, more than in any other, the pride of philosophy had been ordained by Heaven to be utterly confounded, to lie prostrate in the dust. With such considerations as these, we should rather feel inclined to pity the misfortune of the Hindu philosopher, tossed up and down in an ocean of mystery, than regard him with nought but laughter and ridicule.

For showing what the *general character* of Hindu Metaphysics is, let us glance at a few of the fundamental doctrines of some of the chief schools of Hindu philosophy. One peculiar feature in Hindu Metaphysics is, a feature not yet discerned in the Metaphysics of any other nation, viz. that the Hindu philosophers toiled with unwearied industry to turn all things into *nothing*. There is no mind, no matter, say the Hindu philosophers. *No mind*, I mean, no *created mind*. There is only one Mind, and that mind is Brahm, the self-existing God*. Our minds, or rather what we call our minds, are undivided portions of that Great Mind; independently of Him they have no existence. Independently, not in the sense of the creature's dependence upon the Creator for existence and the continuance of that

* The Hindus do acknowledge *one* supreme God.

existence, or in other words for creation and preservation ; for in this sense every spirit, as well every material object is absolutely dependent upon God ; *but* in the sense that there is no entity separate from the entity of Brahm ; no existence separate physically from the existence of Brahm. But you will say, I am conscious that I am ; I think and cannot but think that I am not God but a separate entity from Him. No, says the Hindu philosopher, you do not exist physically separate from Brahm ; you are a portion of the great and universal spirit, an undivided portion of it ; but you *think* otherwise, you are *conscious* otherwise, *because you are ignorant*. Nor, says the Hindu philosopher, is there an external universe. Matter does not exist. You say, I *see* a tree. There is *no* tree, says the Hindu philosopher, you are under an *illusion*. His illusion is stronger far than the illusion of the Western philosophers. Plato and Berkeley never soared upon the wings of a crazy imagination in the atmosphere of a vain philosophy so far as the Indian philosopher. According to *them*, *ideas did* exist ; but according to *him*, ideas do *not* exist. According to *them*, ideas were some immutable entities ; but according to *him*, they are no entities at all. Plato, indeed, believed both in the existence of matter and mind ; but according to *him*, there was no primary correspondence between external things, and ideas of things,—no correspondence, so that our perceptions of external objects would enable us to infer aught aright in the science of matter,—but we must look after those *ideal entities* if we wished to get a sound material philosophy ;—*but*, says the Hindu philosopher, there is no matter, no mind, no perception of matter, no *ideal entities* : all is illusion, all is illusion. “ Look on that pure transparent stream,” says he, “ discern there the silvery moon with her starry gems ; is there a moon beneath the water.” “ No,” you reply, “ but there is a real moon making a false though visible one as it might make ten-thousand others by the laws of reflection and the laws of vision.” “ No, no,” returns he, “ there is no moon beneath the water ; *so*, no moon is anywhere ; all is illusion, all is illusion.” “ Likewise,” continues he, “ no *idea* of moon *as an entity* exists in your mind or anywhere ; the sensation and consequent perception of the moon is no affection of your mind, for your mind does not exist, and you say you *are*, because you are ignorant ; and you say you think you see the moon because all is illusion, all is illusion.” Surely such illusion never entered the brains of any other than a Hindu philosopher ; such illusion we never meet with anywhere but in Hindustán.

This is one system of Hindu philosophy ; let us now turn to another equally sublime. According to this, all things are an *eduction* from the essence of Brahm. All spirits, whether they be the spirits of men, or beasts, or vegetables, or gods, or *usúrs**,

* An evil being of much superior power to man is called an *usúr*.

directly flowed forth from the essence of Brahm. Just as sparks rise upwards to heaven from the blazing fire, so have all these sparks innumerable ascended up from the flame of the divine spirit. These spirits are all *divided* portions of Brahm, in which point this system differs from the former; and into the essence of Brahm they will all one day immerge. They are endowed with consciousness, or rather somehow they have received consciousness,—consciousness, some subtle substance grafted upon these spirits to deceive them into the persuasion that they are separate entities, individual entities, apart from the great spirit, while in truth they are portions and portions only of the divine spirit. At a fixed time all these spirits will fall into Brahm, and he become the sole entity in the universe. Such immersions and emersions, involutions and evolutions have been *from* eternity, and will be *to* eternity. But how comes the *material* universe? This also is an *eduction* from the essence of Brahm. According to this system, matter *exists*. But this matter is an extraction from the spirit of Brahm. Let the philosophers of Europe waste themselves to find out, if they can, how spirit, simple and indivisible, can be evolved into matter. But so it is, says the Hindu philosopher. By a multiplicity of processes the splendid material universe hath risen into being from the spirit of Brahm. Just as the cobweb is spun out of the substance of the spider; so the material universe in all its glory has been spun out of the substance of Brahm. And, as in the former, the process of formation is gradual, so in the latter it is also gradual. There is a multiplicity of processes between Brahm and the manifestation of the glorious universe. Ay, there is a multiplicity of processes too between Brahm and the *rudiments* of this universe. From Brahm emanates intellect, the whole mass of intellectual substance by which we think and reason and perform such intellectual operations. From intellect is evolved the entire mass of consciousness, by means of which I say, this is *my* house, this is *my* book, I am, I live. From consciousness is evolved, first, five invisible subtle elementary particles, the ancestors of the five gross elements; secondly, the eleven organs, the five organs of sense, the five organs of action, and the organ of mind. And by the mixture and composition of all these elementary things, are brought out at length the immediate elements of ~~this~~ external universe, the five gross elements ether, air, fire, water and earth. Wonder as much as you like, *so it is*, says the Indian philosopher. Ask the questions, how is intellect separate from spirit?—how is consciousness separate from spirit?—how is mind an organ and separate from spirit?—how could organs exist before organic beings?—how could particles of matter come out from consciousness?—ask these and a thousand other similar questions; both you and your questions will be blown

over by a storm of unintelligible nonsense, and the Hindu philosopher will frown upon you, questioning the truth of God as revealed in the *shástras*. By a multiplicity of processes then, from the spirit of Brahm are evolved at length the immediate rudiments of this material universe. And according to some, the energy of Brahm brooding over the vast abyss of chaos, brings forth a splendid universe, with all its collocations of parts to parts ; all its dispositions ; all its variety ; all its magnificence. These then, are the peculiarities of the second system of Hindu philosophy. We have seen that according to the *first* system there is no other existence than that of Brahm. *Ignorance* leads us to think that *we* are, that *our existence* is separate from the *existence of Brahm* ; and *illusion* leads us into the persuasion that there is a *real* universe without us. But according to the *second* system both spirit and matter exist, but they have been educed out of the spirit of Brahm. There is one thing, however, in which both these agree. They both maintain that there is always the same amount of existence. There can be *no creation*, for "out of nothing, nothing can come." The same amount of existence *has existed* from all eternity, and *will exist* to all eternity ; only *changes* come upon it in the lapses of duration. During one period of millions of ages, Brahm *alone exists*, in a state of profound sleep, when he is not conscious of his own existence ; and there is nothing beside *him* enjoying ineffable happiness in this unconscious state ; and during the succeeding period of other millions of ages there is the beautiful play of visible and invisible worlds, whether, according to the first system these be all illusory objects, or according to the second these be sober realities*.

What then is the influence of sound knowledge upon Hindu Philosophy ? Its influence is to root up and destroy this glorious system. The Hindu philosopher, bred up in a different school from that of Bacon, never disquiets himself with asking, *how* his system has been raised, upon what foundations of first principles it towers, whether there be a way which would lead one step by step to its summit. He never attempts to *prove* the truth of the doctrines he holds, to resolve the grand ultimate conclusions into their original elements. The truth is, his system *cannot* be resolved into such primary principles in which we must place our undivided confidence. In the perfection of the science of the present age it is easy for us to resolve every science into its original principles. Let us clearly mark out the axioms of Geometry—who in the world is there, still possessing rationality, that will call their truth into question ? Let us follow Euclid in his demonstrations—who amongst us will be so mad as to attempt

* In this part of his Essay the author's own views have been greatly aided and confirmed by Dr. Duff's account of Hinduism in his work on "India and India Missions."—M. I., B.

to show them to be false ? Let us come out well prepared to observe the vast multitudes of stars that stud the wide vault of the heavens, make observations and repetitions of the same,—let us ascertain by repeated observations in a series of ages all but the most uncommon phenomena which the heavens present to our view ;—then let us frame some theory which shall account for all the phenomena observed, and which are never contradicted by opposite phenomena, in this our walk who shall say we are treading a forbidden path ? Once more, let us retire to our closets, let us with the inward eye of consciousness make an internal observation of the phenomena of our own minds, let us read in their actions the minds of others ;—then if we attempt to ascertain the secrets of man's spiritual nature, and say that man is such and such, as an intellectual and a moral-being,—who shall say this is a wrong course ? Suppose now that I make not one observation of one mental phenomenon, and yet dogmatically assert, " Man is such and such, as a spiritual being,"—what madness is there ! Suppose that I make no observation of the phenomena which the heavens present to our view, and yet dogmatically assert, " Such and such is the fabric of the heavens,"—what madness is there ! Precisely such is the madness of the Hindu philosopher. High on the top of his stupendous metaphysics he addresses you, " Come up." " Where are the steps ? sir," you ask, " where are the steps of evidence that shall lead me to you ?"—" Wing your flight," replies he, " as I have done." " I cannot," you say ; " I have been taught in the school of Bacon ; I have no wings of imagination ; my feet are always guided by judgment ; please, sir, if there be any way of evidence leading step by step for such an one as I, unprovided with wings, do me the favour to tell." " No, no," returns he, " there are no steps, you must come up all at once, there are no steps of evidence, you must take the whole for granted and mount upwards." " Well," you reply, " well for you, but as for me—farewell ! Excellent philosopher, you enjoy your height, I cannot reach it."

Thus it is that the Hindu and the Baconian philosophy are contrary to each other. In Hindu philosophy, you must first take the truth of the whole system for granted, and then you go to reconcile some small disagreements within itself, and afterwards if possible you try to bring it to the level of common sense ; that is instead of beginning with the feet you begin with the head, as if men could walk with their heads. And if you fail to do so, even then the system must be true, and there would only be some defect in what is called common sense. Then nature must adapt herself, as far as she can, to the system, and not the system to nature. This is the procedure of the Hindu philosopher, not unlike that of the philosophers of the middle ages. And as modern philosophy has dispelled the clouds of

mystic nonsense which prevailed in the dark ages of Europe, so does it, so will it also disperse the clouds of Hindu philosophic nonsense. How this is done is easily seen. When the demand is made, as to what are the foundations of Hindu philosophy, how is it built up, the Indian philosopher has nothing to answer. Accustomed from infancy to turn imagination into reality, he has so done with his honoured system. The whole system he has taken for granted, and never had a doubtful thought as to its truth suggested to his mind. And this conduct which he has pursued is surely most irrational. The modern philosopher, on the other hand, has pursued a different course. He has placed all his confidence upon the primary principles, the original elements of belief, which God had ordained to form a part of the spiritual character of man, and without which man ceases to be man,—and upon these strong foundations his system is reared up. This surely is right procedure ; but how contrary to that of the Hindu philosopher ! To take the truth of whole systems for granted is easy for the Hindu philosopher ; to take one thing for granted that carries not in itself positive evidence, intuitive testimonial or revealed, is impossible with the modern philosopher. When, therefore, the correctness of modern philosophy and its contrariety to Hindu philosophy are powerfully addressed to reason, how can the latter stand ? When thus hard pushed the philosopher of Hindustán makes one more attempt to recover his philosophy. This he does by turning round and asserting that his system is a Revelation from Heaven. Well, if this be a divine revelation, we ought to receive it upon divine authority alone. But before receiving it as such we have to *ascertain* if it be a divine revelation. Where then is the evidence ? Let it be *proved* that it is really a divine revelation, and then we will attend to it. But this the Hindu philosopher is unable to do. Here also he requests you to take the *divine origin* of his system *for granted*. But no rational creature can respond to so absurd a request. His system therefore ought to be rejected.

(Conclusion of the Essay.)

Such is Hinduism, and such the influence of sound knowledge upon it. We have seen how fatal that influence is to the literature, science and religion of Hindustán ; how it overturns Hindu customs and manners. In fact it overturns every thing Hindu. With the Hindus every thing and all things are incorporated in their religion. Their sciences, their arts are all revealed from heaven. If, therefore, in any way their science is overthrown, their religion is also overthrown with it. The religion of the Hindus mixes with their legislation, fashions their habits, fixes their customs, establishes their institutions, forms their national character.

Their religion guides their science, and controls every branch of intellectual pursuit. Undo, therefore, their religion, and you undo the whole system of Hinduism. The citadel of Hinduism is the religion of the country. Attack, capture that citadel, the system of Hinduism lies a conquered territory. And it is the science and religion of Christendom which have now encompassed round about that citadel. Several of its walls are beaten down, but still it is not surrendered ; but we hope ere long the faith and science of Christendom shall fully be established in India. The resplendent sun of Revelation hath darted forth to the eyes of benighted India. But, alas ! alas ! our countrymen are still asleep,—still sleeping the sleep of death. Rise up, ye sons of India, arise, see the glory of the Sun of Righteousness ! Beauty is around you ; life blooms before you , why, why will ye sleep the sleep of death ? And shall we who have drunk in that beauty,—we, who have seen that life,—shall we not awake our poor countrymen ? Come what will, our's will be the part, the happy part of arousing the slumber of slumbering India.—

“ Shall we, whose souls are lighted
With wisdom from on high ;
Shall we to men benighted
The lamp of light deny ?
Salvation ! O salvation !
The joyful sound proclaim,
Till each remotest nation
Has learned Messiah's name. ’

D E D I C A T E D

(WITHOUT PERMISSION)

**TO ALL, OF EVERY NAME AND COLOUR,
WHO THEORETICALLY BELIEVE, AND PRACTICALLY
ACT ON THE DIVINELY REVEALED
PRINCIPLE, THAT**

“ The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge.”

PREFACE.

1. **THE** design of the following letters was not to enter into the *details* of Lord Auckland's Minute. It was simply to seize on and elucidate *a few of the great principles involved in its leading statements and conclusions*. The details on minor points, such as, the establishment of pecuniary scholarships for meritorious students, the application of the funds granted to the School Society, the preparation of a Manual of legal instruction, and the proper use of School Libraries, are, for the most part, unexceptionable; and offer no points for special remark. The *meagreness* of the notice on two subjects, *so essential* to the spread and stability of National Education, as that of *Normal training for school-masters*, and that of the *efficient and ubiquitous inspection of all grades of Seminaries*, has indeed surprised me; and can only be accounted for by the supposition that the Minute is the product of a superficial amateur educationist, and not that of one who has profoundly studied the subject in theory, or thoroughly acquainted himself with its wants and workings in practice. The former is announced and dismissed by simply remarking, that "another object in these superior colleges ought to be to instruct the pupils, or some proportion of them, for the duties of *inferior* school-masters—and that to this end they should be made thoroughly masters of the class-books and legal or other manuals, which are designed to be used in the lower schools, and with the branches of knowledge which relate to the subjects comprised in them." Here, the *great and specific object* of Normal tuition for teachers, as contradistinguished from the general tuition of ordinary pupils, is not so much as caught

hold of, hinted at, or expressed; and that is, *not merely the replenishment of the minds of future teachers with adequate knowledge, but the training of them into the habitual employment of the best modes of communicating knowledge, by causing "the theory of teaching and the application of the theory to go on simultaneously."* Let any one, at all acquainted with the continental schemes of education, the machinery of which is now so generally admired, say, how very *large and prominent* a place, the subject of Normal primary teaching occupies both in theory and practice. Yet to that point, so all-important, as regards the efficiency and the permanency of an extended system of education, Lord Auckland devotes a *single pointless paragraph*; while to the *comparatively* insignificant matter of *pecuniary scholarships*, he allots *two entire pages* out of the *thirty-six* embraced by his *Minute*—as originally printed! On the latter of the subjects adverted to, or that of "inspection," he has also written very briefly, and with almost more than even his usual fulcrumless balancing. He "would say that the *day may come* when unity and efficiency of supervision will better be secured by having a single superintendent"—that "at *present* he is satisfied that the varied knowledge possessed by the members of the Committee (of Public Instruction) render their services most valuable to the government, and would gratefully retain their aid"—that he "should be happy to receive from them a report of *their suggestions* on the means of procuring an *occasional local inspection* of the institutions under their charge"—that "the experience of their President will have convinced *him* that there *may be* great hazard of the interests of education being seriously retarded by the want of such inspection." How different all this from the prompt and energetic language of the venerable Van den Ende, the Inspector General of primary instruction in Holland! When spoken to by Victor Cousin on the subject, he replied with the unhesitating assurance of an experienced veteran, "Nothing else will do except inspectors specially appointed;"—

adding, "Take care whom you choose for inspectors; they are a class of men who ought to be searched for with a lantern in one's hand!"

2. Many subjects vitally connected with the establishment of a plan of National Education are *wholly overlooked* in the Minute—such as, the desirableness and necessity of re-appointing a Commissioner to carry on and complete the statistical educational chart which Mr. W. Adam, at the suggestion of Lord W. Bentinck, so vigorously begun. Whether the government should or should not adopt the recommendations of the Commissioner, their own deliberations could not fail to be immensely assisted and their conclusions immensely modified by the authoritative facts and statistics collected and arranged by him. As, in his fitful mood of restoration, Lord Auckland was led to revive so much of the *useless*, the *uncalled for*, and the down-rightly *pernicious*, why did not some grave Councillor suggest, by way of partial counterpoise, that he should restore one of *the most useful* and *imperatively demanded* appointments which the Indian Government in its disinterested wisdom ever created, or in its parsimonious folly ever abolished? And should it be happily revived, let it be on a scale commensurate with the requisite talents of the employee and the undeniable magnitude of his undertaking. Who would, except in derision, compare the talents, acquirements and accomplishments of a qualified Commissioner of police with those of a really qualified Commissioner of Education? And yet in a land, and among a society where money, even without brains, is every thing, and brains without money, nothing—money, money, money being at once the *measure of one's importance*, and the *chief end of one's being*,—is it to be endured that the very inferior office of a Commissioner of Police should be remunerated at *treble* the rate of that of a Commissioner of Education? If so, it can only be, because the Government, in spite of its boastful pretensions on the subject, is yet profoundly ignorant of the real nature and extent—the real demands and uses—the real value

and importance of a thoroughly pervasive scheme of National Education—and as profoundly incapable of estimating or duly rewarding the high mental and moral capabilities which ought to be brought to bear upon it. If the Government be *really* sincere on the subject of native education, why should it not, forthwith, secure at any rate, short of that of a Supreme Councillor, the services of such a man as Mr. J. Marshman of Serampore? The report which one so qualified could furnish, within a reasonable period, would supply ample materials for the stimulating and guiding not only of Government, but of private individuals and public Societies, that are actuated with feelings of commiseration and benevolence towards the people of India. To take the lowest view of the result,—the improved resources, which a mentally and morally improved people would be sure to aid in calling forth, would vastly more than compensate for all preparatory and subsequent educational outlays from the revenues of the state.

3. While certain parts of his Lordship's Minute have been warmly applauded, others have been as warmly reprobated. Of the latter, the two great central points are, *the re-endowment of Orientalism, including its false religion*; and *the total exclusion of true religion from the course of higher instruction in the Literature and Science of Europe*. As the act of a Government which represents the British nation, this is neither more nor less than *a national recognition of the false religions of Brahmanism and Muhammadanism*, and, at the same time, *a national abnegation of the only true religion, that is, Christianity*. Surely, surely, this is a great *national sin*; which, if not repented of and removed, may, sooner or later, draw down the most terrible but righteous retribution at the hands of an offended God. "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD and against his Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder and cast away their cords from us. He that

sitteth in the heavens shall laugh. The Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak to them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. *Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings ; be instructed, ye judges of the earth.* Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." Ah, but the avowed and popular doctrine of the day is, "that religion has nothing to do with political measures." Yes, this is the *favourite* doctrine of this politico-irreligious age ; but can a mere multitude of voices constitute it a *true* doctrine? Impossible. True it cannot, and will not be, till it is true "that God does not govern the world ; for as God rules in human affairs, so must his servants obey him." In cases like the present, what becomes of that race of Christian ministers that are *specially* appointed as guardians, to watch over the interests of Christianity among the Europeans—the ruling class of this vast realm ? Why do they seem to remain as silent as if they were fast asleep in the caves and dens of the earth ? The sprightliness of youth and the grey hairs of venerable age, elegant accomplishment and creditable scholarship, devoted piety and goodly eloquence may, doubtless, be found amongst them. But, Oh, for more of the warmth of exhortation—the fearlessness of reproof—the solemn earnestness of protest against the sins and follies of those who, from their rank and power, give tone and fashion to general society, and dictate laws for all India ? Oh, for more of the burning love of souls that would lead men, from inclination, taste and choice, to prefer attendance at the dying pillow of the humble poor to attendance at the luxurious, carnalizing entertainments of the great, the mighty, and the noble of the land ? Oh, for more of the zeal and fidelity and uncompromising boldness of a Brown, a Buchanan, a Martyn, and a Thomason that could, when occasion offered, rebuke even a Governor General to the face, when he dared openly to violate

any of God's holy laws ? Polite manners, a fashionable address, a gossiping turn for frivolous conversation, a tacit connivance at the sinful humours, freaks, and follies of the worldly great, will, of course, secure at once their society and their applause. But surely every godly minister of Christ must feel, that these are not the qualifications and the instrumentalities by which, under the Providence of a Holy God, the divine work of converting souls and edifying saints can ever be expected to flourish, or an Anti-Christian be turned into a Christian Government !

4. As to the notices which the Calcutta Press has taken of the present subject.—The cordial manner in which the *Christian Advocate* (which has lately had the honour of being sneered at by an obscure Barrackpore libeller, who would be both wiser and better if he studied and digested its most useful contents) has approved both of the subject and object of these letters, convinces the author that, in advocating the cause of eternal truth and the good of immortal souls, he has the full sympathy of many a right-hearted man. The *Friend of India* has twice condemned, with great calmness and clearness, Lord Auckland's restoration of Orientalism in the education of the privileged classes of native youth. For this he merits the praise of independence, and the thanks of all who wish to see things in the light, and to weigh things in the balance, of the Sanctuary. From the dignified neutrality of the *Hurkaru*, there is reason ultimately to expect much. Surely he who, in days of yore, so powerfully assisted in securing the reform of the old pernicious Oriental system of education, at the hands of Lord W. Bentinck, will not long suffer any act of even partial retrogression to pass unrebuked. The *Englishman*, on general Indian affairs, always writes with indisputable talent and intelligence. But past experience would lead us to expect, on the subject of religion and religious men, a full flow of wit and ridicule, insinuation and banter, which the candid and thoughtful will always be able to estimate at their proper value.

Nevertheless, by opening his columns so largely to the opposite side, he has put it in the power of his readers to judge for themselves ;—and this is no small commendation in these days of one-sided partiality. As to the *Courier*, despite the *kindly meant* and *sincerely uttered regrets* of some at the notices that have been taken of him, I must still abide by the honestly felt conviction that, after his oft repeated expression of attachment and regard to religion and religious men, it was a most humiliating spectacle, to behold him, from the first, dealing out a strange mixture of aimless inuendoe and impotent ire—all diluted in an equally strange potion of the lowest principles borrowed from the lowest school of anti-Christian liberalism.

More it is needless to say. The whole subject in debate is one of no secondary importance. It involves principles which shall one day test the value of all prevailing systems, agitate whole kingdoms, and decide the destinies of a globe. “The Lord God omnipotent reigneth.” Therefore, shall “all the ends of the world yet remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Him.”

MINUTE

BY THE

RIGHT HON. THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

OF

INDIA.

I have not hitherto, since I assumed charge of the Government, recorded my sentiments at any length on the important questions which regard the best means of promoting Education amongst the Natives of India. The subject is one of the highest interest, and especially calls for calm consideration and for combined effort. But unhappily I have found violent differences existing upon it, and it was for a time, (now I trust past or fast passing away,) a watchword for violent dissension, and in some measure of personal feeling. I judged it best, under these circumstances, to abstain from what might have led me into unprofitable controversy, and to allow time and experience to act, with their usual healing and enlightening influence, upon general opinion. I may earnestly hope that we are now not very far remote from arriving at some satisfactory result in respect to our Education Controversies, and I will approach the topic, with the hope of contributing in some degree to this end.

2. Annexed to this paper will be found a note compiled by Mr. Colvin, containing a condensed view of the principal facts, and of occasional notices of some considerations suggested by them, which relate to the general progress and present condition of the plans of Native Instruction as pursued in different parts of India, and of the tenour of the most important directions on the subject of Public Instruction which have been received from the Honourable the Court of Directors, and with reference to those facts, as they apply particularly to the progress effected in the different Presidencies, and to the circumstances which have come under my observation, when at the seat of several of our Institutions in Bengal, I will endeavour to state with all fairness the conclusions to which I have brought my mind on this subject.

3. I have first however to state my opinions on two specific references connected with the question, which are before me from the President in Council—the one relating to the appropriation of Funds heretofore assigned to particular Institutions, and the other to Mr. Adam's scheme for the improvement of the Indigenous Schools in the Bengal and Behar districts.

4. Before entering on the details of the first of these subjects, I may observe that it may, in my opinion, be clearly admitted, and I am glad from the papers before me, to see that this opinion is supported by the authority of Mr. Prinsep, that the insufficiency of the Funds assigned by the State for the purposes of public instruction has been amongst the main causes of the violent disputes which have taken place upon the education question, and that if the Funds previously appropriated to the cultivation of Oriental Literature had been spared, and other means placed at the disposal of the promoters of English Education, they might have pursued their object aided by the good wishes of all. In the Bengal Presidency, with its immense

territory and a revenue of above 13 millions, the yearly expenditure of the Government on this account is little in excess of £24,000 or 240,000 Rupees*, and I need not say how in a country like India, it is to the Government that the population must mainly look for facilities in the acquisition of improved learning. There is, I well know, the strongest desire on the part of the authorities, both in England and India, to support every well arranged plan for the extension of Education, and the dispatches of the Honourable Court are full of the evidence of their anxiety on the subject. I may cite in particular the declaration of a dispatch of the 18th February, 1824. "In the mean time we wish you to be fully apprized of our zeal for the progress and improvement of Education among the natives of India and of our willingness to make considerable sacrifices to that important end, if proper means for the attainment of it could be pointed out to us." Such we may be assured is the feeling by which the Court is up to this time guided, and the difficulty has been not in any unwillingness to grant the money necessary to give effect to good plans, but in framing such plans, on principles admitted to be satisfactory, and in finding fitting agents for the execution of them. I have alluded to the limited amount and to the existing appropriation of our present funds, not certainly with the slightest idea of casting reproach upon the previous course of administration, but merely as a fact which is of importance in its bearing upon former discussions. The sum immediately at command was limited. Parties wishing to promote the diffusion of knowledge in different forms contended eagerly the one to retain, the other to gain, that sum for the schemes to which they were respectively favourable; and had fresh sums been at once procurable, no one might have objected to their employment for a full and fair experiment on the new ideas which began to prevail. The inference to which I would point from these facts and observations is, that a principle of wise liberality not stinting any object which can reasonably be recommended, but granting a measured and discriminating encouragement to all, is likely to command general acquiescence, and to obliterate, it may be hoped, the recollection of the acrimony which has been so prejudicial to the public weal in the course of past proceedings. The Honourable Court have already, as was to be expected, acted on this principle. They have made a separate grant for the publication of works of interest in the ancient literature of the country to be disbursed through the appropriate channel of the Asiatic Society, and this measure is one which has been hailed with universal satisfaction.

5. On the merits of the first of the two questions immediately referred to me, which I would consider in the spirit which I have here commended, I would at once say, on the position that the Government has given a pledge that the funds heretofore assigned to particular institutions shall continue to be so far ever appropriated, that I cannot hesitate to express my conviction that the acts or intentions of the Government will not justly bear this very exclusive and restrictive construction. I remember the discussion of April 1836, and certainly I did not understand that the Resolution to which the

* Parliamentary Grant,	8,888
Interest on Government Notes,	3,030
Madrasa,	2,606
Sanskrit College,	2,065
Delhi Escheat Fund,	250
Benares College,	1,701

Agra College.

Endowment of Villages,	1175
Interest of Government Notes,	622
	— 1,797

Ferriemsen, Rs. 20,367

Government then came was intended to have the force of a perpetual guarantee of the expenditure, *wholly within each institution*, (whatever might be the nature of the instruction to which they might be devoted,) of the funds which might have been assigned to it. The plain meaning of the proceedings and the profession of the Government seems to me to have been that, stipends having been every where discontinued, it would do nothing towards the abolition of the ancient Seminaries of Oriental learning, so long as the community might desire to take advantage of them—their preservation as *Oriental Seminaries* being alone at that time within the contemplation of either party. Had it been intended to promise that, whether Arabic, Sanskrit, or English were taught, the particular Institutions should at all events be retained, the meaning would surely have been expressed in much more distinct terms. My impression of the state of the case is briefly this—that the General Committee viewing the maintenance of the Oriental Colleges, on the footing to which I have referred, as prescribed and secured, proposed to consolidate all separate grants into one General Fund, the savings of which, after the Oriental Colleges should have been thus provided for, should be held by them to be clearly applicable to their general purposes. The answer of the Government on 13th April, 1836, after a discussion in which I in the first instance expressed a willingness to assent to the propositions of the Committee, was in these guarded terms—“*Under existing circumstances*, the Government in India thinks it will not be advisable to make the consolidation into one fund of all grants, made heretofore by Government for purposes of education, as suggested by the Sub-Committee of Finance, nor does his Lordship in Council imagine that the Committee *will be put to much inconvenience* by drawing its fund separately as heretofore, and crediting them whether derived from a Government monthly grant or from the interest of stock previously accumulated to the particular seminaries to which they have been assigned, leaving any excess available in any institution to be appropriated *as may appear most equitable* with reference to the Orders of Government, 7th March, 1835, and the pledges and assurances *that may have been given* to particular institutions.” The alteration of the word “belong” to “have been assigned” as marked above, will shew the spirit of compromise amongst varying opinions in which the draft was agreed to. There was here no statement that the consolidation was a thing wholly out of the question. The diversion of funds from particular institutions was admitted as a measure which might or might not be proper, and (the circumstances of all institutions not being before the Government) there is a reservation for the pledges and assurances “*that may have been given*” to some of them.

Under such a reservation, if a specific promise in perpetuity of a particular sum to a particular institution could be shown, such a promise would have of course to be respected; but otherwise by these Orders of April, 1836, things were left exactly as they stood before. Whilst however, I am bound to declare that such is my distinct impression on the subject, and whilst for one I would reject the strict principle of absolute and irrevocable appropriation, I am yet strongly of opinion that it will be best on every account to dispose of the question on the principle of a liberal consideration to all wants and claims. I see no advantage to be gained in this case by a close contest for strict constructions, and having taken a review of money estimates and of local wants, I am satisfied that it will be best to abstract nothing from other useful objects, while I see at the same time nothing but good to be derived from the employment of the funds which have been assigned to each Oriental Seminary, exclusively on instruction in, or in connection with, that Seminary. I would also give a decided preference, within these Institutions, to the promotion in the first instance of perfect efficiency in Oriental instruction, and only after that object shall have been properly

secured in proportion to the demand for it, would I assign the funds to the creation or support of English classes. At the same time, I would supply to the General Committee of Public Instruction from the Revenues of the State any deficiency that this Resolution might cause in the general income at their disposal. And if they should already have partially used for other objects, the savings arising from the Seminaries supported by special funds, I would in recalling such savings, protect the General Committee from loss on that account. The Statement in the margin* will shew the contribution from the Revenue which this final settlement of the subject will occasion. It will be perceived that, calculating from the amount of stipends as they existed untouched in the end of 1834, and deducting 1-4th as required at all events for the Oriental Colleges under a Scheme of Scholarships such as I shall hereafter state that I would approve, the additional Annual Disbursement from the Treasury will be about 25,000 Rupees, and perhaps there may be 6,000 Rupees more per annum on account of the office, which has been abolished, of Secretary to Sanskrit College at Benares. I am well persuaded that the Honourable Court will approve of our having closed these controversies at this limited amount of increased expense. I would, upon this understanding, willingly join in the directions sent to the General Committee in the letter of Mr. Prinsep on the 31st of July last, "to avoid making any alienation" (from the assigned funds of the Oriental Institutions) "without previously soliciting the sanction of Government." They should, as I have said, be desired to appropriate the funds within the Oriental Colleges, first to Oriental and then to English instruction. I would not on any account admit the extension of the system of scholarships within these Colleges beyond the general proportion (which should be on a liberal scale) allowed elsewhere, for this would be an excessive and artificial encouragement which might be justly objected to. But I would secure the most eminent Professors for the Colleges. I would encourage the preparation, within the limits of the funds, of the most useful Books of Instruction, such as of the Siddhants and Sanskrit version of Euclid which Mr. Wilkinson has urged upon us, and I would provide in some form which the General Committee should be required to take into early consideration, for an improved and effective superintendence of the Oriental Colleges of the North Western Provinces, where I know that such a supervision is very obviously required. Funds that might still remain available could be doubtless to much advantage devoted to European instruction in union with those particular Institutions, and I should look with very warm interest to an efficient scheme for imparting English Education to Mahomedans at the Madrassa in Calcutta.

6. The other reference made to me is with regard to Mr. Adam's plan for the improvement of indigenous Schools and Teachers. I would observe upon it that it is impossible to read his valuable and intelligent report without being painfully impressed with the low state of instruction as it exists amongst the immense masses of the Indian population. Attempts to correct so lamentable an evil may well be eagerly embraced by benevolent

Amount of Stipends
Dec. 1834. Per ann.

* Calcutta Sanskrit College,	696	...	6362
Madrassa,	664	...	7848
Benares College,	348	...	4176
Agra ditto,	480	...	5680
Delhi ditto,	627	...	7524

39,560

Deduct 1-4th 6339

25,170

minds. Yet I cannot but feel with the President in Council that the period has not yet arrived when the Government can join in these attempts with reasonable hope of practical good. When Mr. Adam enforces his views "for the instruction of the poor and ignorant, those who are too ignorant to understand the evils of ignorance, and too poor, even if they did, to be able to remove them," the inference irresistibly presents itself that among these is not the field in which our efforts can at present be most successfully employed. The small stock of knowledge which can now be given in Elementary Schools will of itself do little for the advancement of a people. The first step must be to diffuse wider information, and better sentiments amongst the upper and middle classes, for it seems, as may be gathered from the best authorities on the subject, that a scheme of general instruction can only be perfect, as it comprehends a regularly progressive provision for higher tuition: In the European States where such systems have been recently extensively matured, this principle is, I believe, universally observed. There is a complete series of Universities in great Towns, of Academies in provincial divisions, and of small local Schools, all connected in a combined plan of instruction. The extension of the plan to the Parish or Village School has been the last stage, as must naturally have been the case, in the national progress. Mr. Adam's plan contemplated such a rise of able pupils from the Village to the Zillah Schools, but the suggestion could not immediately have effect. Here we are yet engaged on the formation and efficient direction of our Upper Institutions. When, indeed, the series of vernacular Class Books for our single *zillah* Schools, which is still a desideratum, and to which I shall subsequently refer, shall have been published, and their utility shall have been established by practice, Mr. Adam's recommendations may be taken up with some fairer prospect of advantage. For the present I would confine our measures in reference to his reports to injunctions on the General Committee that they bear in mind his particular suggestions and objects in determining on the series of Class Books referred to. I would submit the plan to the Honourable Court for the expression of their sentiments and wishes—and in the collection of information for an eventual decision I would make use of the experience which the Bombay measures of Village instruction, alluded to in the note annexed, will have afforded. For this purpose I would communicate Mr. Adam's Report to the Government of Bombay, and ask how far the scheme which he describes is in accordance with that which is pursued in the Provinces of that Presidency—and what opinion may be formed from the result already obtained by their Village schools, of the propriety of carrying out Mr. Adam's plans in their important parts. The encouragement to existing *Schoolmasters*, which is the leading suggestion in Mr. Adam's plan, will probably have been largely tried at Bombay, and the extent to which those School Masters have reaped improvement under such encouragement will be a most interesting subject of inquiry. I learn also in the course of my inquiries regarding the previous progress of Education in India that a School Society existed for some time in Calcutta, the operations of which were directed with partial success to the amendment of indigenous Schools. Mr. Hare will probably be able to explain the history of this Society, which drew a grant of 400 or 500 Rupees a month from Government, and to give also the causes of its extinction: I would ask this Gentleman to favour Government with a report regarding that Society. And I would conclude upon this subject by recording my opinion that, when such a scheme as that proposed by Mr. Adam comes to be tried, the arrangements for introducing it should be on a liberal and effective scale, and that it ought not to be undertaken at all until the Government is satisfied that it has at command a thoroughly zealous and qualified superintendence.

7. Having said thus much in answer to the references made to me by the President in Council, I would proceed to record my observations upon

the topics which seem to me most important in regard to our plans of Education. I strongly feel that, in all that we can do, we must be prepared for much disappointment in our early efforts to satisfy the demands made upon us on this subject. By some it will be lamented that we do not at once perfect enlarged schemes for general Education; by others it will be regretted that what we do for the best pupils of our few Seminaries seems to produce so partial an effect. Feelings of this nature will attend us in whatever attempts we may engage for the improvement of any branch of our Indian Government. Our governing and instructed class belongs to a highly civilized community. It is in active and increasing intercourse with the European world where, in an advanced state of Society, skill and enterprise are daily gaining new triumphs. It is naturally impatient for the introduction in India of every plan which has, though probably after repeated trials and failures, been adopted with success in European countries. And the spirit of free discussion excites benevolent minds to bring forward the most extensive projects. On the other hand, we are dealing with a poor people, to the vast majority of whom the means of livelihood is a much more pressing object than facilities for any better description or wider range of study. Our hold over this people is very imperfect, and our power of offering motives to stimulate their zeal is but of confined extent. The Agency which we can employ for reform is extremely narrow and liable to constant derangement. Of those who are willing to devote their energies to the business of giving or superintending instruction, Oriental Scholars are apt to be unduly prepossessed in favour of acquirements obtained by much labour, and to which they are indebted for their reputation; while mere European Scholars are liable to be ignorant of, and neglect national feeling, or are at all events incompetent to make a proper use of native means for the execution of their plans. Where even the mind of an able pupil has been very greatly informed and enlightened, the knowledge gained by him may seem to produce no adequately corresponding result in after life. The student may stand alone in the family or society of which he forms a part. These can very generally have few feelings in common with him, and he may be unhappy and discontented in his peculiar position, or he may yield to the influences by which he is surrounded, and accommodate himself to the sentiments and practices which his reason had taught him to disapprove. Add to this, that if he finds that his knowledge opens to him the prospect of advancement, he will, under a restricted competition, be over-confident in his own powers and unreasonable in his expectations, while at the same time he will be tempted to relax in the exertions necessary to maintain, or carry forward, the standard of proficiency at which he had arrived. These are circumstances of the operation of which we must all I think in a greater or less degree have had practical experience. I can only say upon them that we must neither entertain sanguine or premature hopes of general success, nor yet allow ourselves to be seriously discouraged. We must be content to lay even the first rude foundations of good systems, and trust for the rest to time, to the increasing demand of the public and of individuals for the services of educated men, to the extension which must every year take place of the Agency for instruction at the command of Government, and to the certain effects of the spread, however slow, of knowledge, and of the gradual growth of wealth and intelligence in the community.

8. I would in now offering my opinions and suggestions on the present practical directions of our plans, desire to consider the question of our educational policy as one of interest to every portion of the empire, without minute reference to merely local and temporary discussions. I am aware that we are yet in expectation of the orders of the Home Authorities on the subject of the changes in the scheme of education in Bengal, which were adopted by the Government in 1835. But I would not on this account longer withhold the explanation of my own sentiments on the course which should

be adopted, and I do not anticipate that in what I shall propose, I shall be found to have deviated in any material degree from the wishes of the Honourable Court.

9. I would first observe that I most cordially agree with the Court in their opinion, which is quoted in paragraph 45 of Mr. Colvin's note, that, with a view to the moral and intellectual improvement of the people, the great primary object is the extension, among those who have leisure for advanced study, of the most complete education in our power. There cannot, I think, be a doubt of the justice of their statement that "by raising the standard of instruction among these classes, we would eventually produce a much greater and more beneficial change in the ideas and feelings of the community than we can hope to produce by acting directly on the more numerous class." It is not to be implied from this that in my view elementary education for the mass of the people is a thing necessarily to be neglected, or postponed for an indefinite period, but it will have been seen that the hope of acting immediately and powerfully on the mass of the poor peasantry of India is certainly far from being strong with me. And the practical question therefore, to which I would endeavour before all others to give my attention, is the mode in which we may hope to communicate a higher education with the greatest prospect of success.

10. One mode which has been ably contended for, is that of engrafting European knowledge on the studies of the existing learned classes,—of the Moulvees and Pundits of India. I confess that from such means I anticipate only very partial and imperfect results. I would, in the strictest good faith, and to the fullest extent, make good the promise of upholding while the people resort to them, our established Institutions of Oriental learning. I would make those Institutions equal sharers with others in any general advantages or encouragements which we are satisfied ought to be afforded with a view to the promotion of due efficiency in study. I would from the funds which have been before allowed to them assist in them, as I have already said, any judicious plans for ameliorating the course of study, as by aiding the publication of works which may seem likely to be decidedly useful to the students. Nor am I at all disposed to undervalue the amount of sound education and morality which is to be acquired at these Seminaries, even without calling in the resources of European Science and Literature. I will not profess deep respect for the mere laborious study of a difficult language, or of the refinements and subtleties of scholastic learning. But sensible, as assuredly I am, of the radical errors and deficiencies of the Oriental system, I am yet aware that the effect of all advanced education, and I will add especially of a Mahomedan education, is in cherishing habits of reflection, of diligence, and of honorable emulation, that it tends also to elevate the tone of moral character, though its practical effect is unfortunately too frequently marred by the domestic and social habits of Oriental life. Judging however, from the common principles of human nature, and from such experience as is referred to in the case of Mr. Wilkinson at Bhopal, it is not to the students of our Oriental Colleges, trained, as it will be admitted that they are, in a faulty system to which they are yet naturally and ardently attached, that I would look for my chief instruments in the propagation of a new knowledge and more enlarged ideas. It was not through the professors of our ancient schools, but by the efforts of original thought and independent minds, that the course of philosophical and scientific investigation and of scholastic discipline was for the most part reformed in Europe. The process of translation, it is to be added, into the learned languages must unavoidably be so slow that, on that account alone, the arguments in favour of a more direct method of proceeding appear to me conclusively convincing.

11. Another class of recommendations is, that all the leading facts and principles of our literature and science be transferred by translations into

the vernacular tongues. Mr. Hodgson, in his book on Education, says, "As a practical measure for the immediate adoption of Government, I have no hesitation in saying that to found a College for the rearing of a competent body of translators and of schoolmasters; in other words, for the systematic supply of good vernacular books and good vernacular teachers, (leaving the public to employ both, in case the Government fund be adequate to no more than the maintenance of such College) would be an infinitely better disposal of the Parliamentary grant than the present application of it to the training of a promiscuous crowd of English smatterers, whose average period of schooling cannot by possibility, fit them to be regenerators of their country, yet for whose further and efficient prosecution of studies, so difficult and so alien to ordinary uses, there is no provision nor inducement whatever."

12. But those who support this course overlook in the first place the extreme practical difficulty of preparing any very extensive course of translated or adapted works. We are speaking now of *the means of an advanced and thorough education*, and not of a limited series of works for the purposes of common instruction, to the compilation of which, as I shall have immediate occasion to remark, I am entirely favorable. The difficulties of translation have been illustrated by our knowledge of what has been effected at Bombay, where the object has been prosecuted with much zeal, and I have annexed to this Minute a list of the works which have been prepared in Arabic by the European Officers attached to the service of the Pasha of Egypt, and it will be seen how very confined the number is, excepting in works of Military, Medical, or other Science. The clear truth seems to be that works of science may, at least to some considerable extent, (their range being necessarily contracted) be rendered into other languages within a comparatively moderate period, but the translation, within any time the extent of which we could reasonably calculate, of any thing like a sufficient library of works of general literature, history, and philosophy, is an impossible task. I have only, therefore, to conclude on this point by stating my entire concurrence in the opinion which has been quoted in the note from a despatch of the Honourable Court to the effect, "that the higher tone and better spirit of European Literature can produce their full effect only on those who become familiar with them in the original languages."

13. I would then make it my principal aim to communicate through the means of the English language, a complete Education in European Literature, Philosophy and Science to the greatest number of students who may be found ready to accept it at our hands, and for whose instruction our funds will admit of our providing. All our experience proves that by such a method, a real and powerful stimulus is given to the native mind. We have seen that in Bombay as at Calcutta, from the time at which effective arrangements have been made for the higher branches of instruction in English, the understandings of the Students have been thoroughly interested and roused, and that the consequences have wonderfully, to use the words of the Calcutta Committee of Public Instruction in 1831, "surpassed expectation." The difficulty which attends this course is the very important one, not of principle, but of practice, namely, that the wants and circumstances of our Indian population bring to our Colleges so few who desire, or are able to receive from us the complete English education, which it is our object to impart to them. Those who look with greater confidence to other methods of diffusing knowledge in this country, dwell especially upon this difficulty. Mr. Hodgson, argues that we have no reasonable ground to hope here for the same wide study of English Literature, and subsequent use of the information acquired in it for the purposes of vernacular composition, as occurred in the different stages of European civilization with reference to the Greek and Roman models from which that civilization was chiefly derived. His words are, "True the difficult and inapt Science of Greece and Rome was in modern Europe, first mastered in itself, and eventually

worked into our own speech and minds. But how? by the employment of means adequate to the end, by the existence of circumstances most powerfully efficient to forward that end. A thousand predisposing causes led a mighty nobility to seek in this lore the appropriate ornament of their rank and station. A Church which monopolised a third of the wealth of the Continent, called Rome its mother and Greece its foster-mother, and throughout the great part of that Continent, the law, Ecclesiastical and Civil, was even lingually Roman. Hence the magnificent endowments and establishments and permanent inducements of all kinds by which a difficult and exotic learning was at length effectually naturalized amongst us. Hence the scholar if he pleased, might pursue in retirement letters as a profession, assured of a comfortable provision *for life*; or if he pleased, he might devote himself to the task of instructing the scions of a most influential and wealthy nobility, all of them from peculiar association necessitated to become his pupils whether they profited by his lessons or not, and thereby affording him the certainty of an enduring means of livelihood, or if he pleased he might pass from the Cloister or the College into the world, and there find the greater part of its most important concerns subservient to the uses and abuses of his peculiar gifts."

14. Mr. Wilkinson has also on different occasions remarked that it seems to him that Education in English should be confined for the present to the Presidencies, and to some of the principal Provincial Stations, as being the only places at which there is yet an actual demand for it.

15. Mr. Adam says of the condition of our English Scholars—"Extraordinary efforts have been made to extend a knowledge of the English language to the Natives, but those who have more or less profited by the opportunities presented to them do not find much scope for their attainments, which on the other hand little fit them for the ordinary pursuits of native society. They have not received a good Native education, and the English education they have received finds little if any use. There is thus a want of sympathy between them and their countrymen, although they constitute a class from which their countrymen might derive much benefit. There is also little sympathy between them and the foreign rulers of the country, because they feel that they have been raised out of one class of society without having a recognized place in any other class."

16. But I believe that, in all these opinions, the practical value of superior English acquirements is very greatly underrated. A familiarity with the general principles of legislation and government, and the power of offering information or opinions upon public affairs in English Reports, (which is the form in which the higher correspondence regarding the British Administration in India will, of course, always be conducted) must be qualifications so directly useful, as (not to speak of the recommendations of an improved moral character), to insure to the possessors of them a preference for the most lucrative public employments, after they shall have acquired that knowledge of life and of business, and that good opinion among those who have had opportunities of witnessing their conduct, which mere book-learning never can bestow. There are as yet, no doubt, circumstances of temporary operation, which will keep for a period our best English Scholars from reaping from their studies all the worldly profit which will ultimately accrue to them. Our course of instruction has not hitherto been so matured as to include any efficient and general arrangement for giving that knowledge of morals, jurisprudence, law, and fiscal economy, which the Honourable Court have so wisely and earnestly insisted on, and which will be most directly useful in the discharge of administrative duties. There are other obstacles also which for a time may impede our young scholars in their desire to obtain public office. They may over-estimate their own pretensions, and decline to accept the subordinate situations which alone it may at first be thought right to entrust to them. The cure for such exaggerated expectations will

come with time. When this class of candidates becomes more numerous, there will be less hesitation with many of them in taking lower appointments. In the meanwhile, it is known that I am not disposed to adopt any special means, which could be felt as doing injustice to the rest of the community, for connecting our educated English students with the public service. The subject has been fully discussed in my Minute in the Judicial* Department of September 4, 1838, the completion of the measures consequent on which I am anxiously awaiting. The scheme proposed by the Honorable the President in Council, to which in that respect I assented in the Minute referred to, included, however, the appointment of a limited number of Native Assistants to some of the best of our Zillah Judges, who would be instructed in the forms and practice of office. And so far there would be an immediate opening for the employment of several of our Students. The general character of my recommendations in that Minute was however, to establish a test of qualification, before selection for the honorable and responsible situation of a Moonsiff, for *all* candidates, wheresoever and in whatever language instructed, and to procure the compilation and printing of Manuals of legal instruction, in the native tongues as well as in English, which might be taught every where by private masters, or in public Institutions. To the principle of this plan I would steadily adhere. But in our Colleges I would carry instruction of this kind further than would be the aim of these Manuals, which would be more proper for use in our common schools. Having thus applied suitable aids for the acquisition of the knowledge most requisite in public life, I would look with assured confidence to the recognition by the community of the advantages of an advanced English Education, comprising those branches of study, a conversancy with which would place an instructed Native Gentleman on a level with our best European Officers. It is true, and no one has more heartily concurred and rejoiced in the determination than myself, that the vernacular tongues and not English will be the future languages of the Courts and Offices in the interior of the country. But this circumstance will in no degree detract from the force of those inducements of English study of which, as regards the vast and most important correspondence which must ever be conducted in English, I have just spoken, nor need I dwell on the degree to which such inducements will be increased by the mere fact of English being the language of the ruling and governing class in India. This is an encouragement to the pursuit of English that will probably greatly counterbalance the want, which has been justly noticed by Mr. Hodgson, of those motives to its cultivation which would have existed in such strength had English been here, as the Classical languages were in the West, the established languages of Theology and of Law.

17. It will be observed that I have referred chiefly to inducements connected with employment in the public service as likely to lead Indian students to ask admission to our Colleges. This we may be satisfied, is the principal motive which will as yet operate to bring them to any of our educational Institutions. Excepting perhaps partially in Calcutta (and possibly, though I am not informed on the point, at Bombay) the wealthy and higher classes of India do not send their sons to public Colleges and Schools. Those who come to us for instruction are in search of the means of livelihood, either in places under the Government, or in situations under individuals, which, in the peculiar constitution of Indian Government and society, bring them in a greater or less degree, in connection with the public administration. I mention this point as explanatory of the importance to be attached to the nature of the instruction communicated to our students. The remark

* Recorded in the Legislative Department.

applies with equal force to our institutions for the study of the Classical learning of the East. Putting aside the money stipends which were formerly allowed, the great object of the students in the Sanskrit and Arabic Colleges of the Government has been to rise to office as Law Pundits and Moulvies in the Courts. The knowledge which gains for men reputation and profit among the Native community, as great religious Teachers, or among the Hindus as proficient in Astrology, is not to be acquired at those Colleges, and will best be obtained elsewhere from private Native instructors. If there be not a demand for the same number of Law Pundits and Moulvies as previously, the attendance at the Colleges may be expected to decline, though in the Arabic in a much less degree than in the Sanskrit Colleges; for Mahomadan studies fit men far more than those of Hindu learning for all the active offices of life.

18. What has been said may suffice to prove that there are weighty and daily growing inducements to the pursuit of English education, if directed with a proper attention to the wants of Scholars and to practical results. It remains that means should be furnished, at least to the most promising of the Scholars, to continue their studies to the desired completion: as incontestible proof appears to have been given that their poverty would otherwise generally compel them to retire from College as soon after their leaving boyhood as an opportunity of securing a provision for their subsistence might be open to them. On this point I will immediately remark separately, but I would here again say, that I am of opinion, in full concurrence with the President in Council, that whatever amount of reward and support for meritorious students may be granted to those attached to our English, should be granted also, in perfectly like proportion, in our Oriental, Institutions. The pledge to maintain these latter Institutions, while resorted to by the people, involves to my mind the clear obligation to maintain them with all the conditions which are judged necessary for the general efficiency of our educational schemes.

19. Assuming upon the preceding reasoning that our aim as regards those seminaries of highest learning which are not, like the learned Eastern Colleges, specially assigned to other objects, should be to communicate European knowledge through the medium of the English language, it is next to be considered what should be the character of the minor Academies or Schools, such as may probably be eventually established at every Zillah Station.

20. I have not stopped to state that correctness and elegance in vernacular composition ought to be sedulously attended to in the Superior Colleges. This is a matter of course in the scheme of instruction. But a question may well be raised whether in the Zillah Schools, the subject matter of instruction ought not to be conveyed principally through the vernacular rather than the English medium.

21. I would certainly be much in favour of that course if I saw any solid reason to believe that instruction of a common order would more readily and largely be accepted from the Government in the one mode than the other. I am quite of opinion that a very valuable amount of useful knowledge may be easily conveyed, when good class books and persons competent to teach from them are provided, through the means of the vernacular languages. And while I am satisfied that some not trivial amount of moral and intellectual stimulus and improvement is obtained from the Minor English Schools at present existing, yet the standard of proficiency in them is probably not so great as that the mass of Scholars in them would not be nearly as much gainers from merely vernacular tuition.

22. It is an argument for the use of the vernacular medium in such schools that, after the first expense of preparing school books has been incurred, instruction in that manner would, it may be expected, be more

economical than through English, which requires the employment of an English master on a salary at least two or three times as high as would be adequate for a native teacher who had received an English education, and was at the same time perfectly conversant with his own tongue. Employment as a School-master would also be a natural and proper provision for studious young men, who had gone through a complete course at the English Colleges. Such a master would of course be able to instruct a class attached to a vernacular school in the first elements of English learning, so as to lay a foundation for those who wished further to prosecute that study.

23. It is a deduction from the saving which the substitution of Native for English Masters in the Zillah Schools might produce, that English superintendence over several circles of such Schools would probably for a long period be indispensable, and a charge on that account must be estimated for. It is also to be reckoned that the cost of compiling and translating a proper series of vernacular class books is likely to be considerably greater than might at first be supposed.

24. I would speak with much respect of the authority of Mr. Wilkinson on this subject. But I will avow that I am by no means convinced of the applicability of his system or suggestions to the objects of a common education. It is, at least, not certain that he will in the end carry the body of Hindu Astronomers along with him in his correction of prevalent errors. In any event it is not the abstruse parts of Mathematical Science which could be of use in our Zillah Schools. In fact Mr. Wilkinson's system is almost wholly dependent on his own eminent personal talents and exertions, his admirable zeal, his great knowledge, the weight of his excellent character, and perhaps also, it should not be concealed, the influence attaching to his position as the British Political Agent. It would not be safe to draw conclusions as to what may best be done by ordinary agents within the British Provinces from what may have been accomplished in vernacular instruction by Mr. Wilkinson in Sehoré. Some of his remarks too as to the failure of attempts at English education within foreign states are not good grounds for anticipating failure within our own districts, where other circumstances and motives are in operation.

25. I do not admit into this discussion the question of promoting at the present time the formation of a body of vernacular literature. Instruction through the vernacular languages, to a definite extent for ordinary purposes, may possibly be, as the readiest mode to the attainment of those purposes, proper and desirable. But anything like a body of enlarged literature can, I am thoroughly convinced, be created only with time, by the unprompted exertions of private authors, when a general demand for such literature shall have arisen among the people. The Honourable Court have in a passage which has been quoted declared themselves strongly in favour of a liberal encouragement of native private authors and translators, and I would by no means dissent widely from their views, though the encouragement must be given with judgment, or the Government will be constantly in hazard of aiding mediocrity or premature and ill-directed efforts. But these are considerations apart from the settlement of the plans of School instruction on which we are now engaged.

26. I have thus stated what has seemed most important on the subject of introducing the vernacular medium in our common District Schools—I mean as to the general principle of such a change; for the measure could not be named as one for very early adoption, with no class books prepared, or Teachers versed in those books yet trained for their duties. And as the contrary system has been actually established, it is right that, unless urgent reasons for abandoning that system demanded attention, it should be fully tried, with the improvements of which it may fairly be susceptible. We may be said to have two great experiments in progress, one in the Bengal, the other in the Bombay Provinces,—the provincial

education being in the former conducted chiefly through the English, in the latter, almost, if not quite exclusively, through the vernacular languages. It will be most interesting that both experiments shall be closely watched, and thoroughly developed. It is possible that in Bengal, in aiming at too much, we may have withheld some facilities for acquiring knowledge which might otherwise have advantageously been left open. And in Bombay the standard of proficiency in the *Mofussil Schools* may have been fixed and allowed to remain too low, with no principle in the scheme by which they are regulated which would constantly animate exertion, and maintain a spirit of progressive improvement.

27. The immediate practical question in respect to Bengal seems to be that which I have before mentioned, namely, whether it may be reasonably supposed that a vernacular would be more readily and largely accepted in our District Schools than an English education, and on this subject I am not able, after much careful reflection, to discover any reasons which could lead me to answer the proposition in the affirmative. Native youths will not come to our schools to be instructed in vernacular composition. This qualification is more quickly and easily to be attained from other sources. We can in those schools draw little, if any, aid from existing native literature. The desire for the new ideas and information which will be imparted at them must therefore be among the great inducements to attendance, and those who are candidates for such instruction will not, I think, in any important degree be deterred by having to undergo also the labour of learning the English character and language. The fact indeed is, as it is to be presumed from the evidence, which has been recorded on the subject, that a knowledge of the English language itself with a view to the business, however humble, of life, is one main object of most of the scholars. It is fortunate that, in the pursuit of such an object, they can be led on to higher studies and ends. For mere instruction of a general nature (such as our masters now give) *through the vernacular medium*, it may, it seems to me, well be doubted whether even the number of pupils would seek our schools who now resort to them.

28. On the other hand, I confess that I regard it as a serious defect in our plans that we have compiled no proper series of vernacular class books. It is obviously desirable that, as we have vernacular classes, the books used in them should not only be correct and elegant in style, but should be themselves of the most useful description. I would urge also the justness and importance of the advice of the Honourable Court, that such a series of class books should be prepared under one general scheme of control and superintendence. Much expense will thereby be saved, and efficiency greatly promoted. The cost would equitably and willingly be divided among many parties. The works would either be selections from English books of instruction already published, or original compilations adapted for native pupils. In either case the charge of the first selection or compilation in English would be borne in part by the Education Funds of Bengal, and in part by those of the other Presidencies, especially by those of Bombay, where such works must be urgently required for the vernacular schools in the interior. The new Patsalah of Calcutta, the projectors of which have proposed a good series of works, would also of course contribute, and aid might be expected from benevolent individuals or associations, in different parts of India. The present opportunity is favorable for entering on the undertaking. When the books shall have been prepared in English, they will afterwards, as the Honourable Court have observed, be translated at each Presidency into the vernacular languages current in it, but the first step for all the Presidencies must be the primary compilation. I would, then, place the body, which at Bombay represents the Government in the direction of native education, in communication with the Committee of

Public Instruction at Calcutta, and make it my first injunction to the latter Committee, in concert with the Managers of the Hindu College Patsalah or others, to draw a definite scheme of the several sets of books wanted for instruction through the vernacular languages in seminaries of ordinary education—then to consider and report by what means, and at what estimated cost, to be distributed among what parties, these books can be drawn up, and with what further cost the printing of them would be attended. With this information before them the Government can determine on the completion of the plan, and on the amount of funds which can properly, independent of the usual income of the Committee, be assigned to it.

29. I need scarcely repeat that I look with particular favour on the suggestions of the Managers of the Patsalah for including in the list of works Treatises on the Elements of Law, general and local, of Political Economy, and of Morals.

30. When the series of class books shall have been printed, and especially when those further Manuals of the Precedents, Rules and Practice of our Courts to which my Minute in the Judicial Department* of September 4, 1838, referred, shall have been added to them and made a part of instruction, it is more probable than at present that students will attend the vernacular classes of our Zillah Schools for the sake of the general and practical knowledge to be acquired at them. In that stage of progress it would be my second direction to the Calcutta Education Committee to relax their rule for the discontinuance of *separate* vernacular instruction, and to allow students to attend the full course of English or vernacular tuition as they might themselves prefer.

31. The day however when all this can be accomplished may yet be distant. It is easy to wish for and to project such compilations as will be requisite for the purpose, but the means in India for the efficient execution of them are unavoidably limited, and in this respect, as in other parts of our endeavours, we must expect delays, and partial disappointments.

32. Meanwhile we have to improve the Institutions which are established, and to make the most of them for the great end sought for. My leading recommendation on this point would be, so to connect our Zillah Schools with the Central Colleges as to give from the latter to the ablest students of the Zillah Schools a stimulus that will carry them beyond the ordinary range of instruction which is reached by the mass of the Zillah pupils. Without such a stimulus, we shall fall short of the point which we must desire to gain in the promotion of national improvement.

33. This brings me to the question of pecuniary scholarships for meritorious students, for such a stimulus as I have spoken of is scarcely to be given excepting by attaching in some form scholarships of that description to the Central Colleges, to which the best of the Zillah scholars may be eligible. On the general question regarding pecuniary support to promising students to enable them to perfect their studies, I think that I may content myself by referring to the facts and opinions which have been detailed on this point; and I will only therefore profess my decided adoption of the principle laid down by the Honourable Court in the words which I shall again quote from their despatch of September 29th, 1830—“*Provided* (they say,) *that the privilege of scholarship is restricted to young men who have afforded proof of a peculiar capacity and industry, it appears to us to be a highly useful and proper mode of encouraging and facilitating their acquisition of high attainments.*” My third present direction to the Calcutta Committee would now therefore be, to consider and report with all expedition on the details of a scheme for assigning a certain number of Scholarships to all our higher Seminaries—those in the English and Oriental

* Recorded in the Legislative Department.

Colleges being in an equal ratio. In consequence of the very general poverty of students I would fix the ratio on a high scale, say at 1-4th of the number of pupils, if that number "should afford proof of peculiar capacity and industry." I do not suggest Scholarships in our ordinary schools, as the most deserving pupils of these will best be provided for in the Colleges, and the average efficiency of such schools can well be maintained by honorary prizes or single donations of money. Of the College Scholarships it may perhaps be the most convenient in the first instance, that some should be assigned in regular rotation to be competed for by the pupils of each Zillah School. The amount ought from the commencement to be enough for the decent subsistence of a Native Student, and there might be some small increase admitted after a year or two, as an incentive to continued effort. On the other hand the Scholarship should be forfeited if a proper standard of attainment were not exhibited at each yearly examination. I would not grant Scholarships for a year only, liable to be then lost if, upon the chance of an examination, another competitor might stand higher on the list; for the uncertain tenure of the emolument would be very unfavourable to hearty consistent study. But I would provide by such safeguards as I have mentioned against the growth of indolence or indifference in the student. Four years is an ordinary period for holding such Scholarships at home, and it may be sufficient here. The following is the scheme of the Flaherty Scholarships in the University College, London, taken from the report of the Council of that Institution for 1838. "They (the Council) have determined to apply the income of this fund towards the formation of Scholarships to be called Flaherty Scholarships, which at the same time that they stimulate and reward the exertions of the students might commemorate the zeal and munificence of this body. This donation increased by the investment of the surplus dividends until the Scholarships are in full operation, together with the sum of £250 supplied by the Council out of the funds of the College, will constitute a fund producing £200 per annum, which will be sufficient to create four Scholarships, each amounting to £50, annually for four years. One of these Scholarships will be vacant every year, and is to be given in alternate years to the best proficient in classical languages, and in Mathematics and in Natural Philosophy, the first is intended to be given in the present year to the best proficient in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy."

34. I would state to the Education Committee, that it is the wish of Government eventually to bring the Medical College at Calcutta within our general scheme on this subject. But I would not press any immediate proposition to that effect. It will be enough to request now that the General Committee report specially in each of their successive yearly reports, whether they think that the time has arrived at which the assimilation could properly be introduced.

35. The fourth point on which I would at present give instructions to the Education Committee is as to the preference to be given to rendering the highest instruction efficient in a certain number of Central Colleges, rather than employing their funds in the extension of the plan of founding ordinary Zillah Schools. I would have the places fixed, with reference to extent of population or convenience of locality, at which it should be the aim gradually to build up these efficient Central Colleges. I would, on a first conjecture, name for them Dacca, Patna, Benares, or Allahabad, Agra, Delhi, and ultimately, though probably at a distant date, Bareilly. At these places, as well as at the Colleges of the metropolis, the course of instruction should be carefully widened and perfected as opportunities offer. The Scholarships to be established at them will provide a class of students, prepared to avail themselves of the utmost advantages which they can afford, and real progress will thus be made, to the good effects of which we

can look forward with reasonable hope. The Committee can act on this view only according to the actual state of circumstances from time to time. At Agra and Delhi, there is already a demand for higher instruction which ought to be satisfied with the least delay possible; elsewhere perhaps the condition of the institutions may not call for or admit of immediate improvement. Where there is no strong occasion for the enlargement of the existing schools into Colleges, the founding of other schools may occasionally be the best and wisest appropriation of the educational income, but I would point it out to the Committee that the first of these objects, when practicable, is to have a declared priority of attention. I would especially invite the Committee to report how the studies connected with jurisprudence, government, and morals may be most readily introduced into our superior Colleges, and particularly whether very early arrangements cannot be made for the purpose in the Hindu College at Calcutta. The revision of the system of Scholarships in that College, so as to obviate the too general course of early withdrawal from instruction, which is now complained of, should have early consideration. Another object in these superior Colleges ought to be to instruct the pupils, or some proportion of them, for the duties of inferior School-masters—and to this end, they should be made thoroughly masters of the class books and Legal or other Manuals, which are designed to be used in the lower schools, and with the branches of knowledge which relate to the subjects comprised in them. Lastly, in order to make the greatest use of the advantages of the Colleges, I would attentively watch the degree to which the students profit by their access to the considerable Libraries which are now attached to many of our Institutions. Important deficiencies in those Libraries should be promptly supplied. A regular register should be kept of the books read by each student, the advancement made in general knowledge by the perusal of these books should be tested by examination, and rewards should be given to the most proficient, and the subject of the employment made of the Libraries should be one for special notice in the Annual Reports regarding each Institution.

36. If instructions founded upon these observations should, with the concurrence of the President in Council, be communicated to the Calcutta General Committee, I would be glad that it should be added to them, that, if the Committee should doubt the feasibility of attaching Scholarships to Central Colleges on some such general scheme as has been suggested for the improvement of the pupils of the Zillah Schools, they will then submit such other recommendations as they may think most likely to promote the object contemplated by that scheme—the advancement of the best pupils of the body of our scholars beyond the present scale of common acquirement being regarded as a point of the first importance in our educational plans.

37. I have not more to observe on the immediate guidance of the measures of the Calcutta Committee. Before leaving the subject, however, I would say that the day may come when unity and efficiency of supervision will better be secured by having a single superintendent of our Government Seminaries, with an adequate establishment, than by retaining the existing large Committee of Members acting gratuitously in the intervals of other laborious duties, and so numerous as necessarily to cause a frequent inconvenience in the despatch of business. At present I am satisfied that the varied knowledge possessed by the Members of the Committee renders their services most valuable to the Government, and I would gratefully retain their aid. But I should be happy to receive from them a report of their suggestions on the means of procuring an occasional local inspection of the institutions under their charge. The experience of Sir Edward Ryan, their President, will have convinced him that there may be great hazard of the interest of education being seriously retarded by the want of such inspection.

38. For the Bombay and Madras Presidencies,—it may be convenient to place those Governments in possession of the substance of the review which has been taken of the facts relative to the progress of education in all parts of India, and to communicate to them also the Resolution which may finally be adopted by the Government, explanatory of its general views on the suggestions which I have offered, and of the orders that may be issued for the guidance of the Committee in Calcutta. These Governments should be specially invited to co-operate, through the bodies charged with the control of Public Instruction under their superintendence, in the common object of aiding the preparation of a useful and comprehensive set of class books, to be afterwards rendered into the vernacular tongues of the several Provinces. In this, as in other parts of the Government,—it is a matter of high importance that there should be a thorough understanding, among the different Presidencies, of the principles observed and plans followed out in each, that the experience of one should be made known for the benefit of all, and that all should work together in the pursuit of the desired result. The Bombay Government I would particularly request to consider the measures, which I have contemplated for raising and adapting to native wants the instruction conveyed in the most advanced of our English Colleges. I would ask also for a distinct and detailed report on the condition of its Mofussil vernacular schools; the precise nature and range of the education given in them, whether at sudder stations or in the interior towns and villages; the manner in which the teachers at either class of schools are selected and remunerated; whether (as has been before alluded to), by superintending and rewarding the teachers of the Village Schools who have not been trained in any of our own Seminaries, sensible good has been effected; whether, where there is no regular European superintendence, these inferior schools are kept in a state of real efficiency; whether inducements in the grant of Scholarships are, and if they are not, whether they may not well be, held out to the best scholars of the Zillah Schools to prosecute their studies further, and to acquire an improving knowledge of European literature; what are the general inducements which bring pupils to the schools, and whether good conduct in them ordinarily leads, as appears to have been approved by the Honourable Court, to employment in the public service. It may be explained that under this Government there has been care taken to withhold any thing like a monopoly of the public service from the scholars of its Institutions,—general tests open to all candidates, and selection by local Officers with regard to known character as well as proficiency in learning, being considered the proper grounds for nomination to public office. If the lads from the schools are drafted largely into official situations, opinions from the European Officers under whom they have served as to the degree of superior fitness exhibited by them would be of value. It is probable that Captain Candy, the Superintendent of the Schools in the Deckan and of the Sanskrit College, could condense the materials for such a report and submit it, with his own comments, without much delay. He will especially say whether the general standard of acquirement in the vernacular Schools is as forward as he could desire, and whether he would recommend the establishment of English Schools, with a due arrangement of merit Scholarships, in a few of the interior districts. He will explain also what is his system in regard to the Sanskrit College at Poona, what improvements through the introduction of European knowledge have been attempted and with what success, and what is the extent and promise of the English classes.

39. Of the Government of Madras, I would ask for information of the present state of education under the direction or encouragement of the State, within those Territories, and as to what proceedings were taken consequent on the expressed desire of the Honourable Court for the foundation of an English College at Madras. The Madras Presidency is remarkable in India

as being that in which a knowledge of the mere English language is most diffused among all who are attached in public or private capacities to European Officers ; but comparatively little appears, in any reports before me, to have been done in order to make such a knowledge conducive to moral and intellectual advancement.

40. In concluding this paper I have to express my regret if it should have extended to an inconvenient length. But the importance of the subject will be my excuse with my colleagues for my having treated it in this manner, with a view to the suggestion of such practical conclusions as may correct existing defects, diffuse more accurate information, and possibly have some effect in satisfying and reconciling opposite opinions.

Delhi, Nov. 24, 1839.

(Signed) AUCKLAND.

Lord Auckland's Minute on Native Education.

LETTER I.

Oh ! for the coming of that glorious time
When, prizing knowledge as her noblest wealth
And best protection, this imperial realm,
While she exacts allegiance, shall admit
An obligation on her part to teach
Them who are born to serve her and obey ;
Binding herself by statute to secure
For all the children whom her soil maintains,
The rudiments of letters ; and to inform
The mind with moral and religious truth.

Wordsworth.

MY LORD,

When the Governor General of India has recorded his sentiments on a great National question, and when these have been rapturously responded to by so many of the councillors, the judges, the secretaries, and the leaders of public opinion, it may be deemed presumptuous in a Christian Missionary to lift up his voice at all ;—more especially, should that voice, however feeble, seem to mingle as a note of discord amid the fresh full gale of popular applause. And so it would be, were the question *exclusively* one of mere *worldly policy*. But, when it is found to be one, which, in its essential bearings, concerns the souls fully as much as the bodies of men—affecting the interests of eternity not less than those of time—the Christian Missionary must not, dares not, be silent,—even if his voice should be uplifted against Kings and Governors and all earthly Potentates. When the honour and glory of his divine Master and the imperishable destinies of man are involved, the Ambassador of Jesus can brook no dalliance with mere human greatness, or rank, or power. In the spirit of St. Basil, in the presence of the Roman Prefect, he is ever ready to exclaim :—“ In all other things you will find us the most mild, the most accommodating among men ; we carefully guard against the least appearance of haughtiness, even towards the obscurest citizen, still more so with respect to those who are invested with sovereign authority ; but the moment that the cause of God is concerned we despise every thing.”

In the influence of policy and arms, you are, my Lord, at this moment, the first man in Asia. Speak but the word for peace or for war, and that word will speedily cause itself to be felt from Ceylon to Bokhara, from the Euphrates to the Kianko. Thus planted on an eminence which would make

most men giddy, it is no small achievement to have so maintained the equilibrium and balance of the mental powers, that, amid the blaze of conquest and the echoes of victory, you could have paused to indite a calm dispassionate dissertation on Educational Economics. But does it follow that the first man in Asia, in policy and arms, must also be the first in the department of intellectual and moral husbandry? This may be;—but all the probabilities are against it. The human mind is no more omnipotent than the human body is omnipresent. The powers and faculties of both are not only limited in kind and in degree, but limited also in the range and sphere of their application. Let any of them be preponderantly exercised in any one department of human thought, or human activity, and in that department may surpassing excellence be attained. But the very vigor and giant development of any one set of powers is apt to dwarf and enfeeble their associate capacities, and utterly unfit them for shining in their own appropriate domains. Must Newton, the greatest of Astronomers, be also the greatest of Theologians? Must Brown, the acuteast of modern Metaphysicians, be also the most brilliant of modern Poets? No. The very superiority of such men, in the several provinces of Astronomy and Metaphysics, generated intellectual habits which, of necessity, incapacitated them for excelling in the alien regions of Theology and Song. When, quitting their own unapproached and unapproachable orbits, they entered other walks, even Newton and Brown shrunk into the stature of ordinary men. And need it excite surprise that he, who is the lord paramount over a hundred and thirty millions of Asiatic subjects;—he, who, from his very position, must be mainly concerned with *the mechanics of human nature*—the *dynamic forces* of armies and diplomacies and legislative enactments!—need it excite surprise that *he* should not be *equally at home* in another and totally heterogeneous science?—a science, which has well been defined, “the philosophy of the human mind applied practically to the human mind?” Impossible. Excellence in the former must create the *habit* of looking *outwardly* at the *visible* play of human passions, human interests, human policies. Excellence in the latter presupposes and demands the *habit* of looking *inwardly* at the subtle agent of spirit—watching the progressive development of its varied susceptibilities and powers—noting their diversified combinations and transformations—and generalizing the laws by which each mystic movement is regulated. The one habit of mind, viewed as the *predominant* one, is not only negatively uncongenial;—it is, in more than one important feature, the positive antago-

nist of the other. That the author of the immortal work on "the Conduct of the Human Understanding" should be the author of the equally immortal "Thoughts on Education," is nothing strange. The intellectual habit, from which the former proceeded, formed the best possible discipline and preparation for the production of the latter. But that the intellectual habit, from which resulted the celebrated *Simlah Ukase* on British Policy in Central Asia, should prove the best discipline and preparation for inditing a *Dilhi Minute on National Education*, would be passing strange. Who, that has studied the human mind, or attended to the lessons of past experience, could reasonably expect Lord Auckland to be *equally at home—equally great—in both*? When the first Statesman in Asia steps aside from *his own* towering eminence to grapple with a theme that is wholly foreign to, and incompatible with, his general habits, he must reckon it no disparagement, if, of him it be recorded, as of Newton and of Brown, in similar circumstances, that he has *gone out as another man*!

Still, as the commentary on Daniel will be perused, *because* it is the product of the author of the "Principia;" and the poem of the "Paradise of Coquettes" will be read, *because* it claims the same paternity as the Lectures on "The Philosophy of the Human Mind"—so will the *Dilhi Minute on Native Education* obtain currency and favour, *because* it is the offspring of a Politician and Statesman who is at the head of the most powerful empire in Asia. And as, in the cases of Newton and of Brown, the splendour of their great—their immortal works—is apt, from the blending of association, to shed and diffuse a portion of their own lustre over the kindred but inferior progeny of the same minds; so, will the dazzling renown of the present Governor General of India, as a Statesman, be sure illusively to communicate a share of its own brilliancy to a production, which otherwise might soon have sunk into oblivion;—a production, which is remarkable chiefly for its *omissions* and *commissions*—remarkable for its *concessions* and its *compromises*—remarkable, above all, for its *education without religion, its plans without a providence, its ethics without a God*!

At the outset, your Lordship propounds your scheme for the final settlement of "our education controversies." In order to render this *vitally important* part of "the Minute" intelligible, it is necessary to refer to the celebrated enactment of your illustrious predecessor, dated 7th March, 1835.

1. By a reference to the *declared sentiments* of the official

organs of Government; as well as by a reference to their *general uniform practice*, it might be demonstrated that, up to 7th March 1835, the *open, avowed, and leading* (though not exclusive) object of the British Government in India was, the *promotion of Oriental Literature and Science chiefly among the higher and more influential or privileged classes of Hindus and Muhammadans*. In *direct opposition* to this scheme of educational policy, Lord W. Bentinck decreed, "that the great object of the British Government ought to be *the promotion of European Literature and Science among the natives of India*," i. e. among the natives of India *generally*, high caste and low caste, influential and uninfluential, without any invidious distinction of persons or worldly condition.

2. Faithful to their avowed principles, and in perfect consistency with their avowed object, the Government Committee had, from the first, sanctioned and employed native professors of the different branches of Oriental Learning. To learned Brahmans or Pandits, to learned Musalmans or Maulavis fixed salaries were allotted. Certain stipendiary allowances were also granted to the majority of the students, during the whole period of their college curriculum. Thus, altogether independent of the large sums lavished on the building and repairs of Colleges, the expenditure on account of Pandits, Maulavis, stipendiary students and other apparatus for the maintenance of Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian lore, amounted to *nearly sixteen thousand pounds sterling annually*! In *direct opposition* to this scheme of educational policy, Lord W. Bentinck decreed as follows:—"It is not the intention of his Lordship in Council to abolish any college or school of learning, while the native population shall appear to be inclined to avail themselves of the advantages which it affords; and his Lordship in Council directs that all the existing professors and students of all the institutions under the superintendence of the Committee shall continue to receive their stipends. But his Lordship in Council *decidedly objects to the practice which has hitherto prevailed of supporting the students during the period of their education*. He conceives that the only effects of such a system can be to give *artificial encouragement to branches of learning*, which, in the natural course of things would be *superseded by more useful studies*; and he directs that *no stipend shall be given to any students that may hereafter enter at any of these institutions*, and that when any Professor of oriental learning shall vacate his situation, the Committee shall *report to the Government the number and state of the class, in order that the Government may be able to decide upon the expediency of appointing a successor.*"

3. The attention of the Public Instruction Committee, says Professor H. Hayman Wilson in his official report for 1831, was early directed to the necessity of supplying the different establishments, under their control, with printed books, in the learned languages. For this end they found it advisable to establish, in the first instance, a printing press of their own. They also subscribed liberally to the publications of individuals at other presses. In this way, the amount expended on *Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian* books, subscribed for, purchased, or printed, from 1824 to April 1831, amounted to not less than *twelve thousand pounds* ! During the *next two years* the *printing* charges alone exceeded *four thousand pounds more* ! —besides the additional items for works subscribed for, or purchased. And these charges were *yearly* increasing, at an *accelerated rate*, up to the day when Lord W. Bentinck suddenly arrested the growing progress by this emphatic proclamation :—“ It has come to the knowledge of the Governor General in Council that *a large sum has been expended by the Committee on the printing of oriental works* ; his Lordship in Council directs that *no portion of the funds shall hereafter be so employed.*”

4. Though the great and leading object of the government Committee was to encourage the study of Oriental Literature and Science, the gradual and ultimate introduction of the more improved Literature and Science of the west was not wholly overlooked. The *first* Institution, however, in the presidency of Bengal, for the dissemination of European knowledge through the medium of the English language, did *not originate* with Government. It arose under the joint auspices of *individual* English and native gentlemen ; and was opened for the first time, on the 20th Jan. 1817. Through various causes, it became in 1823 a Government Institution, commonly known under the name of “ the *Hindu College.*” Some years afterwards the Committee began to append a small English class to their several Oriental Colleges. But, from the excessive tardiness of their movements in this department, and the extreme scantiness of their support, it palpably appeared that, in their estimation, it was, in all respects, a *very secondary and subordinate* object to that of encouraging Oriental Literature and Science, as locked up in the antiquated storehouses of Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian. And meagre and inadequate as this support was, it does not appear that even this little was rendered, in consequence of a due appreciation of the superiority of the English language as a medium of conveying to the educated natives of India the Literary and Scientific treasures of the west. On the contrary, there is ample

documentary evidence to prove that, if European learning was to be communicated to the natives of India at all, *the favourite scheme of the Government Committee was, to impart it through the medium of the learned languages of India—Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian,*—and that the study of the English language was to be encouraged, *chiefly in so far as it could be rendered subservient to the advancement of their own favourite scheme.* Accordingly, those of their number who were in any wise qualified betook themselves to the task of translation. A few works were gradually prepared at an exorbitant cost. At the period when, *in consequence of the admission of several new members,* a new light began to dawn on their minds, £6,500 remained to be expended in completing Arabic translations of only *six* books. At length, on the 7th March, the decree was issued: “His Lordship in Council directs that *all* the funds, which these reforms will leave at the disposal of the Committee, be henceforth employed in imparting to the native population *a knowledge of English Literature and Science, through the medium of the English language.*”

The previous resolutions determined in favour of the *promotion of European Literature and Science to the exclusion of Oriental Literature and Science*; while this concluding resolution decided in favour of an *European medium* to the exclusion of *Hindu and Muhammadan media* of communication. The short and apparently insignificant expression “through the medium of the English language,” proved the death-warrant of translations at the expense of the education fund, into Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian. The work of reform was now complete. The Oriento-maniasts were overwhelmed with amazement and dismay. Their gorgeous visions of literary monopoly, and self-aggrandisement vanished like a dream. In a moment the old and fondly cherished theory, that, if European knowledge is to be conveyed at all, it can only be conveyed through the medium of the learned languages of India, exploded as if smitten with the wand of enchantment. In an instant, the new and obnoxious theory, embodying the simple but grand idea, that European knowledge can most rapidly, effectually, and successfully be imparted to the superiorly educated classes of Natives, *through the medium of the English language,* was exalted to the well earned honour of a station amongst the legislative enactments of the British Government in India.

From this summary, it must be evident that Lord W. Bentinck's enactment amounted to a great deal more than a mere extension of the former Government scheme of education—to

a great deal more than a mere superaddition to some of its provisions. It amounted, immediately or in sure reversion, to an *entire abrogation of the old economy, and the substitution of an entirely new economy instead.* The stout defendants of the discarded regime, who had become more and more exasperated, as their prospects became increasingly desperate, were of course defeated, but not satisfied. And it is to the protracted warfare carried on between them and the advocates of the new order of things, both before and after the 7th March, 1835, that your Lordship has applied the designation of "our education controversies." The wish to terminate these controversies proves the reality of an amiable and peaceful disposition. And so far is the meed of praise pre-eminently due to the Delhi Minute. But the existence of a *good intention* is one thing; *the wisdom and adaptation of the means* of carrying it into effect, quite another. The excellence of the former is admitted; the manifestation of the latter is wholly denied. For, what is your Lordship's *panacea* for the final closing up of all past dissensions, and the sure furtherance of future peace and harmony on "the education question?" It is—by assuming chiefly on the authority of one of the most violent of the disputants, "that the insufficiency of the funds assigned by the state for the purpose of public instruction has been amongst the main causes of the violent disputes,"—to *toss the question of principle overboard altogether*; and resolve the whole affair into a *scramble for money!* It is, by *repealing the greater half* of Lord W. Bentinck's enactment, to *restore the ancient reign* of Hindu and Muhammadan scholasticism! And all for what? Simply to extinguish the smouldering ire of a few doating Orientalists. It is, at the same time, by retaining the *minor half* of that enactment, to perpetuate the sway of Anglicism, as a co-ordinate system. And why? To bribe, if possible, into silent acquiescence, the friends of European Literature and Science. In other words, by the *abolition* of the *abrogatory*, and the *maintenance* of the *substitutionary* clauses of your noble predecessor's enactment, your Lordship proposes to *unite the living with the dead—to revive the spirit of the dark ages and cause it to enter into heterogeneous combination with the spirit of modern enlightenment—to divide the empire of education equally between the devotees of antiquated error and the propagators of acknowledged truth!* Such is the grand specific, which your Lordship fondly expects, is to operate as a *quietus*, in allaying the whole feverish excitement of our education controversies. That it may, indeed, act as a soporific on the spirits of such of the former belligerents, as contended "*mainly*" for the so-called

prize of *filthy lucre*, were nothing strange :—but it would be passing strange, should it be found to act as a charmer in lulling into inglorious sleep those who fought “mainly” for *principles*, on the practical recognition of which depends so much of the temporal and eternal welfare of millions of our Indian fellow-subjects. Here are two systems of education, *directly opposed* to each other, and *absolutely contradictory in their entire substance, scope, and ends*. Reviewing these two systems, Lord W. Bentinck,—with the straight-forward bearing of British manliness and British courage in the spirit which fired the old barons of Runnymede, and with the decisive energy of uncompromising principle,—thus pronounced his decision : “Regardless of the idle clamours of interested partizanship, and fearless of all consequences, let us resolve at once to repudiate altogether what is demonstrably injurious, because demonstrably false; and let us cleave to and exclusively promote that which is demonstrably beneficial, because demonstrably true.” Reviewing the very same system, my Lord Auckland,—with what looks very like the tortuous bearing of Machiavellian policy, in the spirit of shrinking timidity which heretofore hath compromised the success of the best laid schemes, and with the Proteus-like facility of temporizing expediency,—thus enunciates his contrary verdict : “Fearful of offending any party, wishing to please all, and anxious to purchase peace at any price, let us,—dropping all minor distinctions between old and new, good and bad, right and wrong,—let us at once resolve to embrace and patronize *both*, and *both alike* :—

“Tros Tyriusve mihi nullo discrimine habetur.”

In a word, “Let us,” says Lord W. Bentinck, “*dis-endow error, and endow only truth* :” “Let us,” replies Lord Auckland, “*re-endow error, and continue the endowment of truth too*.”

A decision, so wholly at variance with every maxim of truth and righteousness—a decision, so utterly repugnant to the progressive spirit of the age ;—what valid plea, what plausible grounds can be adduced to justify ?—Justify ! It surely must scorn all justification as impossible, and any attempt at justification as the most ludicrous farce. But seeing that *vindication* is impracticable, does it not admit of some *palliatives* ? If palliatives there be, they may be summed up in a single sentence ; viz. that it was most kind and amiable to sooth the expiring sorrows of the superannuated remnant of the race of Orientalists, who, like the owls and the bats, have such a special affection for the dingy and the dismal edifices of hoar antiquity ; and who, like these lovers of darkness, are

ever ready to break forth into strains as doleful as the notes of a funeral dirge, when the crazy crevices in which they have so long nestled are threatened with extermination ! Most kind and amiable we admit all this to be ! But, beyond this admission, where are we to look for grounds of palliation ?

Was the decision demanded by the promptings of *generosity* ? At this your Lordship seems to hint, when you remark " that a principle of wise liberality, not stinting any object which can reasonably be recommended, but granting a measured and discriminating encouragement to all, is likely to command general acquiescence." In *the abstract*, nothing can be sounder than this remark. But the real question is, Whether the object proposed by your Lordship be one which can " reasonably be recommended ?"—and, Whether the application thereto of state funds be an exemplification of " a principle of *wise* liberality ?" Tacitly to assume these two points is an absurd begging of the whole question. I deny that the re-endowment of a system, which, like the venomous night-shade, has for ages benumbed the national mind of India, can be *reasonably* recommended. I deny that money applied to re-establish and perpetuate its noxious efficacy can possibly flow from a principle of *wise* liberality. All this will appear more fully from what follows. Meanwhile, I am ready to maintain that there was no want of generosity in Lord W. Bentinck's enactment. If the funds, abstracted from Sanskrit and Muhammadan Colleges, had been merged into the general revenue, there might have been some room for the charge. But this was not the case. The funds, it is true, were alienated ; but they were only alienated from the encouragement of one kind of literature, which was worse than useless and rapidly becoming obsolete ; and applied to the diffusion of another kind of literature, which is fresh, vigorous, and eminently productive of good,—a literature, which to say the least, seems to be equally well appreciated by the natives themselves. They were merely transferred from one educationary field to another, that promised a richer harvest. The *object* proposed was still one and the same, viz. the cultivation of the native mind ; but the *mode* of culture was altered. The old worn-out implements of intellectual husbandry were exchanged for new, improved, and more efficient ones. Where was the lack of liberality manifested here ? On the contrary, this was a "*wise* liberality," because it was the liberality of *principle*. Yea, it was nobly *generous*. Formerly, justice was every where administered according to Hindu and Muhammadan law, as treasured up in Sanskrit and Arabic ; and, in the native courts, all cases, civil and criminal, were pleaded and recorded in the Persian lan-

guage. Hence were we continually reminded by the advocates of the old system that it was generous, if not necessary, to aid in qualifying natives to assist, in various capacities, in the administration of justice. Now, however, the scales began to be completely turned. A new code of laws for all India was about to be prepared in English; and in that language, agreeably to your Lordship's important remark, "the vast and most important correspondence" (connected with government and other public business) "must ever be conducted;"—while the vernacular tongues, and not Persian, "will be the future languages of the Courts and offices in the interior." Was it generous to aid in preparing individuals to act as native pleaders, councillors, assessors, and judges under the old system? And must it not be equally generous to do the same under the new? Yea, in this right view of the case, were not the best interests of the people more than generously provided for, when funds, formerly expended in qualifying for a *system* about to be abolished, were all transferred and appropriated to the preparing of agents to act with intelligence and vigor under that which was to be substituted in its place? Had your Lordship imitated the wise and generous policy of your noble predecessor; and, instead of reviving, at so large an expense, an effete and noxious system, had you persevered in the spirit of his new and productive application of the lapsed funds;—more especially, had you increased tenfold the means of an improved education through the medium of English and the vernacular dialects;—then, indeed, would your Lordship's administration be characterised by one splendid manifestation of the "principle of a wise liberality," directed to the promotion of an object which could not only be "reasonably recommended," but warmly extolled. Whereas, by adopting the contrary course, your Lordship has just succeeded in exhibiting to the world, *an object without a reason, a scheme without wisdom, a liberality without principle!*

Was your Lordship's decision demanded by the exigencies of *state policy*? No. There are seasons when, amid the eruptions of popular fury, rulers think themselves constrained to make concessions which their own better judgment may condemn. But, in the present instance, no such state necessity can be pleaded. True, certain native inhabitants of Calcutta did, in the exercise of their rights of citizenship, deem it proper to petition the Government on the subject of its new Education Act. But what of that? If, amid the vague and undefined notions of a first surprise, some alarm had been excited in unobservant minds, would it not be the duty of a great, wise,

and magnanimous Government, conscious of the integrity of its motives and the rectitude of its principles, to remain unmoved? And if it did so, would not such alarm, like every other ebullition of ignorant clamour, prove transient as the ruffling of the waters by the passing breeze? Would not the continued good faith and unabated kindness of a paternal Government speedily allay all groundless surmises? Would it not, by giving substantial proofs of its own more enlightened views, very soon succeed in dispelling the darkening visions of those idle alarmists who are so apt to be haunted with images of terror? And would not the settled and permanent security which they would find still extended to all they most valued, open up a natural safety-valve for the escape of all heated fancies and doleful presages? But, in the present case, there was no room at all for the exercise of such magnanimous policy. Your Lordship, therefore, very wisely does not so much as even hint at such a ground of vindication. The fact is, that the number of natives, *directly* affected by the proposed education reform, constitute but an *exceedingly minute fraction* of the general population. The educational advantages previously conveyed, whatever these might be, were *wholly engrossed by a very small body of the learned classes*. The great mass of the people were *wholly excluded* from the benefits of the literary monopoly. Ninety-nine in a hundred knew little, and cared less, about its nature, objects, workings, or privileges. And of the small monopolist fraction, in consequence of the judicious provision of the enactment, not one living member was to suffer, whether student or professor, whether secretary or superintendent. All were to enjoy their respective pecuniary immunities, whether these were stipulated for a limited period or for life. The existing incumbents were thus allowed gradually to wear out, or die out. Hence the change, from the position of active support to the condition of a wise neutrality, was made to progress so insensibly as to provoke little or no murmuring, and excite little or no real opposition. And when any little murmuring or opposition which had been manifested by a few selfish partizans was daily shrinking away into evanescent or infinitely small quantities; then it was, that your Lordship, not only without any urgencies of state policy, but without any urgencies at all on the part of those most directly concerned; yea, and in spite of the reclaiming good sense of the community at large:—then it was, that your Lordship gratuitously resuscitated a system which has not only its brow deformed with the wrinkles of old age, but its whole form and aspect deeply branded with the rotteness and dishonours of the tomb!

Was your Lordship's decision demanded on the score of *right and justice*? No. Your Lordship at once disowns the proposition so foolishly assumed by some of the ultra-orientalists, viz. "that the Government had given a pledge that the funds heretofore assigned to particular Institutions shall continue to be so for ever appropriated;" and you at once "reject the strict principle of absolute and irreclaimable appropriation." So far your Lordship has decided soundly; and this is the part of your Lordship's Minute which opens up a cheering glimpse of the prospect of an eventual return to a better order of things;—it is the fulcrum on which another Governor General is invited to poise his lever for the upsetting of that fabric of delusion and error which has now been restored. But—letting that pass—I proceed, in re-echoing your Lordship's declaration, to remark, that nothing could be more preposterous than the pleas and pretensions of the Ultras in orientalism. For, how stands the case? At certain intervals, during the last fifty years, voluntary grants have been made by successive governments, for the encouragement of native Literature in a few Institutions established by Government itself. Will it be presumed that the Government of the day, acting under a sense of its responsibility towards the public weal, has not a legitimate right to review, alter, amend, or annul the acts of former administrations? Will it be pretended that it cannot, without breach of faith, divert privileges previously conferred into new and more profitable channels? Will it be disputed, that it cannot, without being impeached with the charge of injustice, resume, and apply to better ends, grants spontaneously proffered by itself? Could it be shewn that, at any time, when the British smote into the dust the confederacies of the Indian Rájás and Nawábs, mounted the throne of the Great Mogul, and wielded the imperial sceptre over a domain more extensive, an empire more consolidated far than that of the mighty Aurengzebe;—could it be proved that then, or at any subsequent period, the Government had really pledged itself, had actually entered into a solemn compact with the representatives of the people of India, to devote *in perpetuity* a determinate amount of funds for the *specific* purpose of encouraging native Literature, in certain Native Institutions;—then, indeed, but not till then, might the sudden or gradual withdrawal of such funds *seem* to implicate the good faith, the honour, or the justice of the British Government. But as no such pledge, according to your Lordship's own admission, was ever given, as no such compact was ever entered into, as the boon conferred was of the nature of a pure gratuity and not of a vested right, as the pecuniary grant bestowed was wholly unfettered

by terms or conditions, having no guarantee whatsoever for its permanency but the free will and pleasure of the existing Government;—what imaginable foundation was there for the outcry of the Ultras respecting the violation of pledges, rights, and justice? Was it an outcry which could be tolerated without stultifying the free deliberations of legislative councils, nullifying their peculiar and inalienable rights, and establishing a principle which might serve to eternize error, as well as attach the seal of unchangeableness to truth? And yet, in spite of all this admission on the part of your Lordship, and all this demonstration on the part of reason, your Lordship has concluded by conceding to the noisy claimants fully more than their unfounded and injurious demands! It is much the same as if,—on my purse being demanded by some sturdy petitioner on the highway, and after not having succeeded, both by arguments and blows, in demonstrating that he had no right to it and could not get it without my permission,—I chose to wind up the fierce encounter, by granting to him all that he had asked, with something extra, out of sheer good-nature, to encourage him in future, still to persevere in the same honourable calling!

It thus appears that *not the shadow of a reason* can be adduced in favour of your Lordship's restoration of what your noble predecessor had abolished. But the question rests not on *negative* grounds alone. There are *positive* reasons, at once resistless and unanswerable, *against* the act of restoration. These have already been alluded to in different forms. But the vast importance of the principle at issue, to the millions of this benighted land challenges a more detailed notice. In order, then, to understand these reasons aright, we must start with asking what is meant by *Education*? In its highest and noblest sense, it must denote *the improvement of the mind, in all its capacities, intellectual, moral, and religious*. But let us adopt what definition we may; let us reduce it within its narrowest limits; let us restrict it to the mere formation of the *intellect*, and the question still remains, *How is the intellect to be formed or cultivated? Is it by the inculcation of error, or the introduction of truth?* Doubtless by the latter, will all, with one accord, exclaim.

The next step, then, is to apply this *indisputable* test or canon to Oriental Literature. Will it abide the application or not? If we were to give implicit credit to some of its idolizing eulogists it would. And sorry I am to find your Lordship *apparently* giving countenance to the *gross delusion*, when, in the spirit of well-meant but ill-timed complaisance,

you state that you “see nothing but good to be derived from the employment of the funds which have been assigned to each Oriental Seminary, *exclusively* for instruction in, or in connection with, that Seminary”—and further declare that you are not “at all disposed to undervalue the amount of *sound education and morality* which is to be acquired at these seminaries.” True it is, that, as in the case of all other formal and fulsome compliments, your Lordship cannot long be consistent with yourself. For, in the *second* paragraph *after* the *last* quotation, you proceed to state that you are “assuredly sensible of the *radical errors and deficiencies* of the Oriental system.” So far, then, as your Lordship is concerned, with the bane you have taken care to supply the antidote—the one statement admirably neutralizing the other.

But there are others besides your Lordship, with whom we have to do in this matter. The Oxford Professor of Sanskrit, H. H. Wilson, Esq., who may well be allowed, from his eminent attainments, to represent the Orientalists generally, has, in an elaborate article in the Asiatic Journal, resolutely declared that, to the natives of India, their own writings are invaluable, not merely as the repositories of their religion and laws, but on account of their salutary influence in maintaining amongst the people a “respect for science, a veneration for wisdom, a sense of morality, a feeling of beauty, a regard for social ties and domestic affections, an admiration of excellence, and a love of country.” If all this were true, and if it were the whole truth, one might be at a loss to know how to vindicate the conduct of Government in so summarily resolving to banish native Literature from its intellectual gymnasia. But the moon has two faces,—one very dark, and the other faintly luminous. And so we suspect has Oriental Literature. The luminous side has now been presented to us in its fairest array; but we must not forget that there is a dark side too; and that it has been painted in such gloomy colours, that Cimmerian, or Egyptian darkness, would fail in supplying representative emblems of it. To the all-comprehending system, or vast ocean (as an Asiatic would term it) of Oriental Literature, some would not scruple to apply, by way of accommodation, the cutting satire of Ferdusi, respecting the imperial splendour of the court of Ghizni: “The magnificent court of Ghizni,” said he, “is a sea; but a sea without bottom and without shore; I have fished in it long, but have not found any pearl.”

In this however, as in all other cases, truth will be found to be intermediate between the extremes. Let us freely concede that the Literature of Hindustán contains a proportion of what is sound, beautiful, and true, in principle, imagery,

and fact ; and that it embodies a hundred-fold more of what is original and curious, than is to be found in the ancient Literature of any other nation in or out of Christendom :—and what of all this concession ? The grand question still recurs :—Is it not one thing to regard a Literature as an inexhaustible field for literary, scientific, and theological research ; and quite another, to cherish it as the sole nursery of intellect, morals, and religion ? And in spite of occasional truths, beauties, and excellencies, is it not true that Oriental Literature is throughout impregnated with a great deal more of what is false in principle, erroneous in fact, and, by consequence injurious in moral tendency ?

That the truth of this could be shown, is beyond all controversy. To advance all the proofs, would be to transcribe the greater part, by far, of these enormous piles of writings which ages of “learned and laborious trifling” have accumulated. This would be impossible. In any case, therefore, we should be obliged to rest satisfied with a few gleanings which might serve as specimens of the materials which compose the greater part of the huge misshapen mass. In the selection of such specimens, we would not require to roam over the wide field of Oriental Literature. As has already been shown, the old Government Committee published or patronised, to a great extent, works of native authorship, for the express purpose of being employed as class-books in the colleges established or superintended by them. These works, therefore, we should have a right to consider as the best and most useful to be found in the classical language of India, and consequently, in the estimation of the Committee, the best adapted for the instruction of Indian youth. Of course, in selecting our specimens from these publications the most zealous Orientalist could not charge us with acting unfairly towards his favourite theme. Did our space admit of it, we might here present the reader with extracts from these, the choicest works of Hindu Literature, which would demonstrate that in them are taught :—*1st. Things frivolous and useless. 2nd. False chronology and history. 3rd. False science. 4th. False civil and criminal law. 5th. False logic and metaphysics ; and, 6th. False morals and religion !* After such a statement, need one word more be added in vindication of an act that proposed to sweep away all such false systems from the Government schools and colleges for the instruction of youth ?

Still, the friends of Oriental Literature plead hard for a suspension or modification of so severe a verdict. One of these has lately reminded us, that it is “a prejudiced and ignorant criticism that looks only for blemishes in the literature of the

East." Would to God that this Literature were such, that it really required the scrutiny of a prejudiced and ignorant critic to detect its blemishes! What! is it insinuated by this remark, that the blemishes are so few, that the microscopic eye of prejudice alone could discover them? and so slight, that the blundering gaze of ignorance alone could magnify them into serious faults? If so, then do we throw down the gauntlet, and declare (while we challenge any Orientalist living to disprove, by written documentary evidence, the declaration) that the foulest blemishes pervade the entire mass; that they pervade it to the extent of composing the main part of its ingredients; and that, instead of being isolated spots, which would elude the glance of any eye save that of prejudiced criticism, they are the real or supposed excellencies which may truly be characterized as isolated spots, thinly strewn over the vast surface, like rare islets of verdure scattered over the great African desert!

Again, it has been alleged, that if Oriental Literature be superseded on account of its blemishes, every other literature, even that of England, must be laid aside too, since the latter is not without its "foul spots." Never was there a comparison that would appear more unfair and disingenuous. The Literature of England has, it must be admitted, its foul spots. It has its idle and frivolous publications; it has its works that inculcate false principles in science, in morals, in religion. But are they all of this description? Is the greater part, or even the one-half, of this description? If not,—rather if the greater part be of an entirely contrary character, or even so large a proportion of it, as to supply a complete course of sound knowledge, unmingled with error in every branch of inquiry, literary, scientific, and theological,—then do we hold it to be "foul scorn," to compare the universal literature of England with the universal literature of India, which cannot produce a single volume on any one subject that is not studious with error; far less, a series of volumes, that would furnish any thing bearing the most distant resemblance to a complete range of accurate information in any conceivable department of useful knowledge.

Once more, the study of the Indian classics, as they have been politely designated, has been defended on the ground of its being analogous to the study of the Greek and Roman classics in Great Britain. Never was there a more fallacious analogy. In Britain, the study of the Greek and Roman classics forms but a fraction of a collegiate course of instruction. In the Sanskrit and Muhammadan Colleges of the East little else has been taught; and till of late, nothing except the

niceties and subtilties, the extravagant legends, and worse than fantastical speculations of the Indian classics. In Britain, whatever injurious impressions might otherwise be produced in the mind, by the perusal of the Greek and Roman classics, are more than neutralized by another and a higher species of teaching, even that of Christian tuition, whether in the domestic circle, or in the public sanctuary. In India, there is nothing to neutralize the evil; no true religion instilled into the youthful mind to counteract the pernicious influence of what is false. In Britain, both teachers and taught know and acknowledge that the religion of Saturn and Jupiter is not only a false, but a dead religion, wholly divested of the influence which it once exerted over the European mind; and that the writings which unfold its doctrines and its practices are possessed of no divine authority. In India, the religion of Brahma is still a *living* religion, fraught with malignant energy, and operating with undisputed sway on the understanding and the consciences of millions. There, too, the classics that are its repositories are studied, not as mere literary productions, but as *divine scriptures*; works that either issued directly from the mouth of Brahma at the time of the creation, or were subsequently written under divine inspiration of some kind. Every thing contained in them is regarded as sacred truth, every thing enjoined in them as sacred law, having the stamp and signature of divinity. And to make assurance doubly sure, they have been taught and expounded in the government institutions, to heathen youth, by brahmans or heathen priests; whose duty, and profession, and interest it is, to maintain their authority as imperative and supreme in science, law, morals and religion. In circumstances so absolutely diverse, does it not seem to savour of something like impertinence to say, that the study of the Greek and Roman classics in Great Britain bears any analogy to the study of the Indian classics in seminaries established along the banks of the Ganges?

Thus it appears that every attempt to defend the Indian classics as the exclusive or even chief instrument in the education of native heathen youth, only recoils with more deadly force on the strongholds of the unhappy defenders.

Seeing, then, that whatever definition of education may be adopted, it must exclude the inculcation of error; and seeing that the Indian classics abound throughout with *radical errors and fatal untruths*, was not the Government of Lord W. Bentinck amply justified in resolving to banish these from its schools and colleges? Was it not more than justified in refusing any longer to expend its revenues in hiring students

to learn, and professors to teach, what is *notoriously false in history and chronology, in geography and astronomy, in logic and metaphysics, in civil and criminal law, in morals and religion*;—*enforced as all such instructions were and must be, by the overawing influence of sages, and the uncontrollable authority of the gods?*

And seeing that the reasons which so amply justified the renunciation of Oriental Literature and Science in the education of native youth are *still the same*—unchanged and unchangeable—how ought we to reprobate that act of my Lord Auckland by which these have been restored to their wonted supremacy?—an act, so wholly gratuitous;—an act so wholly without any valid reasons, yea, so absolutely in spite of reasons, the most cogent and resistless;—an act, which tends to roll back the tide of improvement—re-introducing the logomachies of a barbarous scholasticism, the legends of a debasing idolatry, and the subtleties of an impious Pantheism into fields, whence they were beginning to die away before the vigorous shoots of literary, scientific, and religious truth! What! Would not your Lordship shudder at the very thought of expending the revenues of the state, or any revenues at all, in establishing manufactories of deleterious drugs for the express purpose of poisoning the fountains of water and the garnerers of provision throughout the land? And, what is *error*, but *the poison of the soul*? And ought a being, distinguished by the gifts of reason and benevolence, to shrink less from the wilful ruin of the souls of men than from the wilful destruction of their bodies? Surely, my Lord, when the hosannahs that rise from present success are hushed, and the mind has retired into the chambers of imagery, and conscience has been re-vivified by inward reflection and the monitions of Providence,—surely, your Lordship will be the first to shudder at the remembrance of having, without a cause, re-opened and re-endowed on the soil of poor unhappy India, those laboratories of intellectual, moral, and religious poison which your noble predecessor had so generously resolved to close! Language utterly fails me in attempting to embody my own impression of the degradation, the ignominy, the sin, of so fatal—so disastrous a retrogression!

These words, my Lord, are penned in the full assurance, that in this age of canting candour and gilded hypocrisy, they will be denounced as presumptuous, intolerant, and exaggerated. Nevertheless, truth is truth, and error is error, though a whole guilty world should conspire to break down the divine landmarks by which they are eternally separated. These

words are also penned in the full assurance, that with your Lordship and Councillors they will not have the weight of a feather. So let it be. *Here*, your Lordship is *every thing*. *Here*, politically and civilly speaking, *your voice* is all but omnipotent. Speak but the word, and thousands are ready to shout. It is the voice of a God ! Speak but the word, and thousands more are ready to fall down and worship whatever idol or image you may be pleased to set up. *Here*, on the other hand, the humble Missionary, in a *worldly* sense, neither is, nor desires to be, any thing. Let him but speak the word, and lo, it is the voice of a fanatic ! Let him but give forth his warnings, and lo, they are treated with supercilious scorn or branded as a grand impertinence. But, my Lord, I must remind you that the greater the power, the more tremendous the responsibility ! I must also remind you that,—apart from the solemnities of the Great Assize to which the noble and the mighty will be summoned, without respect of persons, along with the poorest and the meanest of the land—there is, even here below, another tribunal, of a different frame and texture from that of an Asiatic time-serving, favour-seeking community, at whose bar the appeal of a gospel minister will be heard as promptly as that of the noblest Lord. There is a British public, and above all, a religious public in Great Britain, which heretofore hath been moved, and may readily be moved again, by the addresses and expostulations of a Christian Missionary. It was the righteous agitation of this public which wrenched asunder the bars of prohibition to the free ingress of Bibles and Heralds of salvation into India. It was the righteous agitation of this public which accelerated and ensured the abolition of the murderous rite of Suttee (Sati.) It was the righteous agitation of this public which foredoomed the ultimate severance of official British connection with the mosques and temples and idolatrous observances of this benighted people. And rest assured, my Lord, that as certainly as the rising sun chases away the darkness of night, so certainly will the righteous agitation of this same British public eventually wipe away, as a blot and disgrace, from our national statute book, that fatal act, by which your Lordship has restored the government patronage and support to the shrines and sanctuaries of Hindu and Muhamadan learning—with all their Idolatrous, Pantheistic, and Anti-Christian errors ! A surer prospect of earning the garland of victory, no Christian Missionary could possibly desire, than the opportunity of boldly confronting, on a theme like this, the mightiest of our State Functionaries, in the presence of a propitiacious audience of British-born free-men, in any city or district,

from Cornwall to Shetland. His march would be that of one continued conquest. The might and the majesty of a great people, awakened to discern the truth and import of things as they are, would increasingly swell his train. And, from the triumph of indomitable principle in Britain, would emanate, as in times past, an influence which would soon cause itself to be felt in the Supreme Councils of India—and thence extend, with renovating efficacy, through all its anti-religious Schools and Colleges.

A. D.

P. S.—The author cannot but express his high satisfaction at the spirit and the power manifested in the *condemnatory part* of the *first* notice of “the Minute” in the *Friend of India*. It was altogether worthy of the reputation of that most able, useful, and influential Journal. In his next letter, the author expects to enter on a part of “the Minute,” which it will afford him no ordinary pleasure to be enabled conscientiously to applaud, with as great earnestness as he has felt himself constrained to reprobate the portion commented on in the present.

Lord Auckland's Minute on Native Education.

LETTER II.

Oh ! for the coming of that glorious time,
When, prizing knowledge as her noblest wealth
And best protection, this imperial realm,
While she exacts allegiance, shall admit
An obligation on her part to *teach*
Them who are born to serve her and obey,
Binding herself by statute to secure
For all the children whom her soil maintains,
The rudiments of letters, and to inform
The mind with moral and religious truth.

Wordsworth.

MY LORD,

Wealth, rank, station, power, sovereignty:—these united in one person, are stupendous gifts of Divine Providence—stupendous for good or for evil. Neglected and abused, as in the case of a Roman Nero, they become the most frightful scourges of humanity and draw down the most terrible retribution at the hands of an offended God. Cultivated and well directed, as in the case of an English Alfred, they become founts of the richest benefits to the race of man, and sources of reversionary bliss to the happy possessor. And though few there be that ever sink into the depths of guilt entailed by the vices of the former, or rise to the pre-eminence of glory that crowns the virtues of the latter, there is not a point along the whole vast line of gradation between these extremes, at which the words, the example, or the decisions of an earthly potentate may not powerfully operate for weal or for woe. If this could be doubted, the calculating facility with which your Lordship conceived the great bad measure reprobated in my last, and the over-mastering, though it may be, noiseless energy with which the apparently most stubborn materials have been moulded into willing instruments to give it full effect, must stand forth as ineffaceable monuments of demonstration. Doubtless there may be esoteric elements which, if divulged, might tend to modify the aspect of the question; but, as we have no access to the thoughts of princes or the counsels of state, we can only look at the exoteric. Looking at these, the spectacle presented is, indeed, a strange one—forcing us to watch and to wonder at the talismanic influence of the wand of power. Glance we at the past:—Behold the Committee of Public Instruction manfully fighting the battle of Educational Anti-Orientalism, under the

shadow of Lord W. Bentinck, and cheerfully giving effect to his paramount will. Glance we at the present :—Behold the Committee of Public Instruction, under the fostering shadow of my Lord Auckland, adroitly passing over to the other side, as cheerfully ready to execute his paramount though *contrary* will. Proh Tempora ! Proh mores ! We had thought *some* of them at least men of principle, who had built their conclusions on a rock which the tempests and the torrents of opposition might assail in vain. But, lo, they all act like men of shifting, sand-like expediency which the gentle gale of viceregal favour has blown into shreds. One Governor General frowns on the State Institutions of Orientalism and blasts them with the breath of his sore displeasure. “ Well done, my Lord,” exclaim the Public Instructionists, “ well done ; *so perish all endowments of error.*” Another Governor General smiles propitious on the State Institutions of Orientalism, and revives them with the breath of his approving complacency. “ Well done, my Lord,” re-echo the Public Instructionists, “ well done, *so re-flourish all endowments of error.*” In our ignorance of the esoteric mysteries of state councils, how are we left admiringly to cry out :—What must be the latitude and the longitude of the policy of him, who could so calmly abide his time—waiting till the lamentations of the chief mourners were ended, and the most interested friends had become reconciled to the loss of their darling Orientalism—and then going forth, amid the silence and the gloom of ill-omened auguries, to resuscitate the hydra-headed spectre which had been formally consigned to the befitting mansions of the tomb ? What must be the latitude and the longitude of the allegiance of those, who,—after having, under the former Government Head, witnessed or even assisted in celebrating the funeral obsequies of this gaunt Oriental antagonist,—could now march forward in the rear of the new Chief to behold his intended feat of resurrectionism, and exult at the re-appearance of the disinterred apparition, and eagerly join in re-equipping it for its wonted vocation of fell revelling among the blighted intellects and the withered hearts of a deluded and benighted people ? If justice and truth *could* allow it, gladly, oh, most gladly would celestial Charity draw her benign veil over the whole ; and breathe forth unto Heaven the God-like prayer, “ Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do !”

One of the earliest and most lamentable results of your Lordship's act of restoration will be, *the re-introduction of the old confusion of ideas on the subject of Oriental Literature*

and Native Education—and the ultimate realisation of all the unhappy consequences to which such confusion inevitably tends. Already, in the distant horizon, do I behold symptoms—significant symptoms—of reviving opinions on this head, whose portentous shadows, when they gather into strength, may well scare away a Governor General, less resolute and less fraught with the true reforming spirit than the last. It is well then betimes to sound a note of warning. From the constant and almost exclusive employment of Oriental Literature in the education of native youth, these two wholly “distinct and distinguishable” things, viz. the Patronage of Oriental Literature, and the Advancement of Native Education, came to be perpetually and systematically confounded. The Educationists of the old regime held these to be *inseparable*, if not altogether *identical*. And what was the unavoidable consequence? The instant, Lord W. Bentinck simply decreed that Oriental Literature, bestrewn as it is throughout, with what your Lordship justly terms “radical errors and deficiencies,” should be withdrawn from the Government education of native youth, and a true and wholesome literature substituted instead,—that instant, the snug little coterie of Oriento-maniasts, alarmed at the disjunction of what they held to be incapable of being riven asunder, rent the air with their hoarse murmurings and bitter plaints. The Corypheus of the storming party actually pronounced Lord Bentinck’s enactment, “an act of extermination against the literature and classical languages of Hindustán.” From these and other similar terms, in which he and his co-adjutors spoke and wrote and raved on the subject, one ignorant of the facts might naturally have supposed that it threatened to deluge the shores of India with fresh floods of bigotry and intolerance—that it threatened to recal “Chaos and Old Night” from their long undisturbed slumbers, and reseal them on the throne of worse than Gothic darkness and error. One might suppose, that it was an act which might have been concocted in the barbaric council chamber of Genseric or Attila; or, that it might have issued from the conclave of the Caliphate at the time, when, from the Tagus to the Jaxartes, its destroying sword had obliterated the records of every faith, save that of Allah and his Prophet; or, that it might have formed one of the ruthless decrees of Mahmoud of Ghizni, who, from time to time, “pounced like an eagle from his tremendous eyry amid the snows of Caucasus on poor unhappy India, and having snatched his prey, instantly flew back to his mountain domain,” leaving behind him temples desolated, idols trampled in the dust, and the sacred archives of the

gods—the written monuments of a literature, and science, and theology, that proudly boasted of an immeasurable antiquity,—devoured by the blaze of many a wide-spread conflagration.

Whatever may be alleged as to this being an exaggerated picture of the opinions and forebodings of certain doating Orientalists, no one at all conversant with their views will be disposed to deny that there is a deep, and broad, and strong foundation for it. Bating the use of comparisons altogether, language was employed on the subject that admitted of no equivocation and no mistake. The act, not virtually, but actually, was characterized as a scheme for the total extinction of native classical literature—as a project for the annihilation of all the languages of India, vernacular or classical—as a measure for the abolition of all native institutions for native education. And having thus characterized, or rather caricatured, the act, it required neither the wisdom of a sage, nor the vaticinative powers of a seer, to prognosticate that it might involve the most mischievous consequences,—that it might tend to alienate the minds of the natives by impressing upon them the conviction that they and their rulers had conflicting feelings and incompatible interests,—that it might be calculated to destroy all respect for the British character, yea to endanger the stability of the British power,—and, finally, that it might contribute to retard indefinitely, if not altogether to prevent, the intellectual, moral, and religious improvement of the people.

Those who indulged in such retrospective criminations and prospective fears might be sincere in their convictions; but most assuredly, they were woefully mistaken. Whether the sudden dissipation of their own congenial dreams might have somewhat excited the heat of indignation which enveloped the judgment with fumes, while it had quickened the activities of the fancy, it is not for us to say. But certain it is, that they did seem to contemplate the subject through some hazy medium, like travellers in the morning viewing the face of nature through those misty exhalations which distort the forms of things, as well as expand them into disproportionate magnitude. For how stood the case? When presented in its bare literality, it was neither more nor less than this.—The British Government at one time voluntarily allotted certain funds for the cultivation of Native* Literature in connection

* The expression "Native Literature" or "Oriental Literature" for want of a better, is employed here and elsewhere to denote *all native writings* of every description, whether strictly literary, scientific or theological. It is employed in this all-comprehending sense as exceedingly convenient to prevent the recurrence of constant circumlocution.

with Native Education in certain institutions, founded by itself. The same government afterwards deemed it expedient to determine to withdraw these funds from such allotment, and apply them to the encouragement of European literature and science.

Now, it matters not a jot in this part of our inquiry, whether the government views of right or expediency in effecting this transfer were defensible or not. The simple question that arises here is—Did the withdrawing of certain funds from the support of a few native institutions, originated by government itself, amount in any reasonable sense to an abolition of *all* native institutions? Did it amount to an extinction of *all* native classical literature? In other words, was the simple *withholding* of *direct positive* encouragement to the study of Oriental Literature in the instruction of native youth, equivalent to a direct active discouragement of Oriental Literature altogether,—amounting to a persecuting prohibition or a general extermination? Why, if common sense has not fled the habitations of man, this determination of withdrawing direct positive support from native literature in the Education of Native youth, could not be construed to mean a downright actual suppression or extirpation of that literature either in whole or in part. It was simply a return to the first position of *strict neutrality*; it was the re-assumption of an attitude of *non-interference*; it was a resolution to *do nothing directly and actively, in connection with National Education*, either for or against, either to uphold or to abolish, native literature. So far as the British Government was concerned, it just left that literature precisely as it existed before its interference at all; i. e., it resigned the classical literature of India to the patronage and support of the descendants of those who have cultivated and perpetuated the knowledge of it during the last thirty centuries, together with their voluntary European allies.

Again, how, or in what conceivable sense could the application of any funds whatsoever to the purposes of English education, be interpreted as tantamount to an attempt to annihilate all the languages of India, vernacular and classical? As well, surely, might we assert that endowments for encouraging the study of Latin and Greek in the island of Great Britain were destined to exterminate the language which Shakespeare, and Milton, and Addison, had rendered classical, with all its provincial dialects! Or, let us refer to a contemporaneous case somewhat parallel. The British Government, at the present time, deem it proper to vote an annual grant of money for the cultivation of Popish literature in the college

of Maynooth. Now, the same government may, for good reasons, afterwards find it expedient to withdraw this grant, and devote the sum so withdrawn to the encouragement of general English education. Should it actually resolve thus to retrace its steps, could such an act of withdrawal and appropriation, we ask, be designated, with any semblance of propriety, an act for the abolition of all Popish institutions—for the extinction of all Popish literature—and for the extermination of the Latin and Irish languages? Stript of all adventitious colourings, and presented in this simple light, the proposition seems too ludicrously absurd to be for a moment entertained. Yet such, and none other in spirit and in letter was the proposition which some of our great Orientalists were so prodigal of their strength in attempting to establish. And think you, my Lord, that the successors of such men as H. H. Wilson, Esq. and the late lamented Mr. Prinsep and Dr. Tytler, are likely to manifest more discretion and display greater acuteness and practical sagacity than they, in distinguishing the things that differ, and in cleaving to the things that are really most excellent?

Still, though the charges of "extermination," "extirpation," and "destruction" may thus be shewn to be contemptibly ridiculous, many of the Oriental fraternity, unwilling to be baffled, and ready, like drowning men, to cleave to a floating straw, turn about, and, occupying new ground, rally round a new standard. With the Sanskrit professor of Oxford they eagerly join; and, adopting his *patriotic* language, exultingly ask, Has not Native Literature rightful claims on a government which has "usurped the power and absorbed the revenues of those who were its natural guardians?"

Now, in all such scornful taunts and criminative upbraidings there is still predominant the same confusion of ideas respecting the patronage of Oriental Literature and the Education of Native youth, as well as not a little mis-statement of historical facts. If it be insinuated that the resources of the natives have been so crippled by our Government, that their own institutions must droop and languish from inability to support them, nothing can be more wide of the truth. There have been all along native Colleges in great abundance, in which the classical languages of India, particularly Sanskrit, have been cultivated in the highest perfection. These, in many instances at least, are as flourishing now, as they have been for centuries past—rendering the establishment of similar institutions on the part of the British Government, not only a work of rivalry, but of perfect supererogation. "Government colleges," remarked the Editor of the *Friend of India* some years ago, with

equal precision and truth, "in comparison with the indigenous colleges, are as a pool of stagnant water, compared with the flowing stream of the Ganges. The country needs not the support of Government to keep alive a knowledge of this sacred tongue, (Sanskrit.) The patronage under which it flourishes, is not the smile or the gold of a foreign government, but the high dignity and distinction with which classical reputation is rewarded, in the wide circle of native society. That encouragement has hitherto been more efficacious in producing great scholars, than the patronage of the British Government, and for many years to come, this is likely to be the case."

Again, if it be asserted that native literature has claims on the patronage of the Government, and then *assumed* that the *only* way of meeting these claims is to support colleges where the study of it may be *exclusively* prosecuted by numbers of *the privileged classes of native youth*; and if this assertion and assumption be held to be correlative, in so much that, if the latter is not, the former cannot be;—then must we, while admitting the validity of the assertion, utterly negative that of the assumption.

There are two objects essentially distinct, the one from the other, viz. the patronage of native literature, and the education of native youth. These objects, though clearly distinguishable, are by no means incompatible. A liberal and patriotic Government may, in certain respects, without inconsistency and without collision, extend its countenance to both. That Government should decline employing native literature as the primary instrument of imparting knowledge in the education of native youth, is no reason why, separately and for other ends, it might not effectually patronise it.

To illustrate what has now been advanced, let us suppose that our ancient Scottish literature has rightful claims on the patronage of the home government. Well, Sir Walter Scott has collected and published some volumes of border songs and ballads; and Mr. McPherson some volumes of the traditional remains of Celtic poetry. Now, might not Government legitimately extend its patronage to our ancient literature, by conferring honorary titles, or bestowing pecuniary largesses on those who devoted their time and their talents to the work of rescuing from premature decay its most curious relics? But, might not the same Government justly object to the application of any portion of the revenue, to the endowment of seminaries on the Tweed or on the Tay, for the purpose of furnishing an education to hundreds of youths, in which the *staple article* consisted *exclusively* of

border legends and Ossianic tales? So in India. Government may deem it expedient, to a certain extent, and for specific purposes, to patronise native literature; while, for valid reasons it ought to demur at the support of institutions for the *exclusive* cultivation of it, in the *tuition* of hundreds of *native youth*. Government, in order to cherish and gratify the spirit of literary research, may supply the means of publishing correct editions of standard classical works; it may encourage translations of these into the English language; it may, by honorary titles or pecuniary rewards, stimulate researches into the history, the philosophy, the religion, and the antiquities of Hindustán. All this the Government may do, and much more. To the encouragement of such pursuits within moderate limits, even Mr. Ward, with all his horror of Hinduism, would not object. He, himself, in substance, proposed that a society should be formed either at Calcutta or London, for improving our knowledge of the history, literature, and mythology of the Hindus,—that a pantheon should be erected for receiving the images of the gods, cut in marble; a museum also, to receive all the curiosities of India, and a library to perpetuate its literature,—that either individuals should be employed in translations from the Sanskrit, or suitable rewards offered for the best translation of the most important Hindu books.

Now there is already in existence a Society founded by that prince of Orientalists, Sir William Jones, in Calcutta, for the realization of these very objects. "Let Government, therefore," said the friends of *genuine* education, *six* or even *ten years ago*,—"let Government, if it will, constitute this venerable patriarch of all our Literary Institutions, its official Almoner for dispensing its patronage of Oriental Literature; and let a portion of the public revenue be appropriated to this special and commendable end." For such an *ulterior* arrangement Lord W. Bentinck's enactment paved the way. And nought in the Delhi minute has afforded us greater pleasure than to learn that the Court of Directors have now made "a separate grant for the publication of works of interest in the ancient literature of the country to be disbursed through the appropriate channel of the Asiatic Society." This is as it should be. Many and interesting are the purposes to which carefully collated and revised editions of such works may be subservient. If philology be an object of pursuit;—where can be found the superior of the Sanskrit,—said to be the most copious, and certainly the most elaborately refined of all languages, living or dead? If antiquities;—are there not monumental remains and cavern temples scarcely less stupendous

than those of Egypt—and ancient sculptures which, if inferior in majesty and expression, in richness and variety of ornamental tracery, almost rival those of Greece ;—and over the design and purport of these what can be expected to throw some glimmerings of light, if not the ancient Indian records of story and of song ? If the intellectual, the moral, and the social history of man ;—are there not ample stores of poetic effusion and extraordinary legend, with whole masses of subtle speculation and fantastic philosophies and prodigious mythologies, exhibiting infinitely varied and unparalleled developments of every principle of action that has characterized fallen degraded humanity ? If an outlet for the exercise of philanthropy ;—what field on the surface of the globe can be compared to Hindustán, stretching from the Indus to the Ganges and from the Himalaya to Cape Comorin, in point of *magnitude and accessibility combined, and peculiarity of claims on the sons of Britain*—the claims of not less than a hundred and thirty millions of fellow-subjects, sunk beneath a load of the most debasing superstitious and the cruelest idolatries that ever polluted the surface of earth or brutalized the nature of man ?—and in order to reach most effectually the heads and the hearts of these multitudes with a view to their improvement, what more necessary than to become acquainted with the subject-matter or contents of those works which are the real and original sources of all their prevailing systems, opinions, and observances, sacred, civil and social ? Thus it is that, in the hands of men of superior principle and superior enlightenment—the Antiquarian, the Linguist, the Philosopher, the Philanthropist—the stores of Oriental Literature may be made to subserve a variety of purposes fraught with interest and profit to mankind at large, and especially to the people of India. What friend of man, therefore, would not rejoice in any measure which tended to bring these stores more availably within the reach of those who have the wisdom and the will to turn them all to their legitimate uses ? Well, then, and truly has your Lordship described the liberality of the Hon'ble Court towards the Asiatic Society in this matter as a manifestation of Legislative munificence which has been “*hailed with universal satisfaction.*” Yea, my Lord, so far am I, or the thousands who think with me, from being opposed to the cultivation of Oriental Literature by qualified persons and for useful ends, that we should hail with still greater satisfaction, the intelligence that you had consigned the whole *lakh and a half*—now worse than uselessly expended in indoctrinating the minds of numbers of native youth with errors, and *the* *against the truth of history, the truth of science, and the truth*

of God—into the hands of the Asiatic Society. From such a fund, that noble Society might maintain at Calcutta, Benares, and Delhi, Colleges of a dozen learned Pandits and Maulavis, chosen and appointed on account of their superior acquirements, for the express purpose of bringing to light, collating, editing, and publishing authoritative editions of every work of note in Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian. From such a fund, they might maintain two or three European Superintendents of eminent scholarship, like H. H. Wilson, or the late Dr. Tytler or Mr. J. Prinsep, for the express purpose of being employed in counselling the native *savans* in their critical and editorial labours; or in furnishing translations or summaries of native works into the English language; or in traversing the country, with a view to decipher and collect the somewhat hieroglyphic inscriptions on the rocks, and columns, and ancient edifices of India. Such an application of the funds might well be hailed as conferring an inestimable boon not on India only, but on the whole literary, scientific, and religious world.

But, my Lord, there is another and a totally different object, which the Indian Government professes to have sincerely at heart; and that is, *the education of native youth*. For the more effective superintendence of its schemes in this most important of all departments in the State, the Committee of Public Instruction was duly organized. "Let the Government, then," said the friends of *genuine* native education, "let the Government, if it will, still continue to repose its confidence in this Committee, as the sole depository and distributor of its bounties, in diffusing the blessings of *sound and useful knowledge* throughout the land." Now this was precisely one of the leading objects which Lord W. Bentinck's enactment so conclusively effected. By this enactment, the connection of the members of the Public Instruction Committee, in their united corporate capacity, with the cause of Oriental Literature was wholly severed; their gregarious wanderings into its boundless and pathless domains were wholly arrested; and their official functions, as its patrons and cultivators, wholly suspended. By this enactment, the Committee was just recalled to its proper sphere, and restricted to its proper orbit. By this enactment, it was destined to become in reality what its name truly imports, a Committee of *Public Instruction*—a Government Committee, *not for the rearing of an inferior class of native smatterers in Oriental Literature, but for the instruction of the youth of India* in those branches which alone, as constituent parts of healthful tuition, ought ever to have been employed by an enlightened government in the

educational development of the youthful mind, viz., the ennobling Literature and true Science of Europe, as contradistinguished from the debasing Literature and false Sciences of Asia: By this enactment, the two great objects, the patronage of Native Literature and the *real* Education of native youth, were designed to be kept, as they should always have been, perfectly distinct. By this enactment, it was determined that they should not, as before, be again intermingled—that each should be prosecuted, if prosecuted at all, separately and apart by itself, under its own proper designation—and that the gratification of a literary curiosity, or the prosecution of learned research, or the official countenance of Oriental Literature, however laudable, should never again be confounded with *popular education*; that is, with one of the most effective means of removing the intellectual, moral, and social degradation of a mighty people, by the replenishment of the national mind from the exhaustless reservoir of all-comprehending truth. What friend of India ought not to rejoice in the provisions of an enactment purposely designed to issue in so noble a consummation? And in proportion to our joy, must be our unfeigned sorrow in the contemplation of that fatal resolution, by which all this has been defeated, reversed, and undone! How must your Lordship's Act of restoration—that act *by which the operation of printing Oriental works, from education funds, is to be begun anew; and the decree has been passed for the re-establishment of Oriental Literature, as the main if not exclusive commodity in the education of thousands of native youth, who are thus armed with augmented power to perpetuate the reign of error and superstition,*—how must such an act tend to revive in the breasts of Orientalists the old fond delusion by which Native Literature and Native Education became inextricably interblended—and the promotion of the one was held to be equivalent to the advancement of the other! Yea, how must such an act, at the present time and in present circumstances, revive the delusion with redoubled energy; inasmuch as it tends to excite the peculiar enthusiasm that ever springs from the reconquest of a once lost but now recovered territory! Rest assured, my Lord, that when the accumulating force of public opinion in Britain shall compel some future Governor General to rescind your Lordship's ill-fated act, it will be found that your Lordship has now prepared materials out of which the whole mournful tragedy of clamours about “injustice to the rightful claims of Oriental Literature,” and “acts of extermination against it,” and “the sway of gothic barbarism,” must be enacted over again. Then, too, will it be found, that, in the meanwhile, by so cautiously

throwing down the gauntlet, your Lordship's Minute, instead of putting an end to "our Education Controversies," has just served to evoke a spirit of righteous indignation, whose fearless freedom, in the cause of God and man, must soon prove that the real battle is only beginning to be rebegun,—with this notable difference, that the principal scene of warfare may henceforward be transferred from the limited locality of Indian province, to the mightier stage of Imperial Britain?

Leaving, for the present, this hostile theme, most gladly do I pass on to another more genial to my own mind, and more creditable to your Lordship's genius and sagacity as a statesman. Overlooking all subordinate though important questions as to *mode and manner and practical details*, the two great generic and positive measures of your Lordship's Minute are ;—1st. The determination, *as regards the use of Oriental Literature in the education of the privileged classes of native youth, to restore all that your noble predecessor had with so much of sound wisdom and benevolent feeling resolved to abolish* :—2nd. The determination, *as regards the introduction of European Literature and Science through the medium of the English language, to uphold with augmented efficiency all that your noble predecessor had with such generous and enlightened policy resolved to establish*. The former of these measures I have, from the honest convictions of my own understanding and conscience, and with the fearless freedom of a Christian man and a British subject, earnestly reprobated. The latter of these measures, I am, in like manner, prepared, if need be, as conscientiously and fearlessly to vindicate in the face of any mustering array of opposition. And I do now, in my own name and that of hundreds in India and of tens of thousands in Great Britain, who have the cause of native improvement seriously at heart, tender the most unfeigned thanks to your Lordship for a decision not less distinguished for its wise statesmanship than for its capability of being converted into a fertile source of blessings to India.

But this subject, as your Lordship's Minute very distinctly indicates, does not and cannot stand by itself. It does not and cannot maintain an attitude of isolation away from the joint confederacy of other educational powers. It neither can nor ought to be separated or viewed apart from those varied measures, the combination and aggregate of which constitute a complete system of national education, any more than the key-stone can or ought to be separated and viewed apart from the other arch-stones, columns, and cornices, the combination and aggregate of which constitute a com-

plete bridge. Intelligibly to discuss all these allied and interblended topics, would be to enter into no brief elucidation of general principles, and to furnish no meagre catalogue of statistical and other details,—in other words, would be to compose a voluminous dissertation on the wide and all-absorbing theme of national education. Such an attempt is of course wholly out of the question in a letter like the present, even if the author felt himself vastly more competent than he does, for so grand and momentous a task,—a task, compared to the *full and adequate* execution of which, the solution of the celebrated “problem of the three bodies,” which for ages puzzled the brains of the greatest mathematicians, were a jest,—a task, the unravelling of all whose apparently inextricable complexities, and the sounding of all whose apparently unfathomable depths, and the adjusting of all whose apparently irreconcilable interests, would strain the noblest energies of the brightest genius—consecrated though these might be by the incense of devoutest piety, and enriched by the spoils of all experience, and stimulated by the fire of the purest, most disinterested, most Catholic philanthropy.

At present, therefore, it is not possible to do more than simply to advert to one or two leading points; and that chiefly with the view of obviating, if possible, certain prevalent *misapprehensions* regarding them. Your Lordship has very properly remarked, “that a scheme of general instruction can only be perfect, as it comprehends a regularly progressive provision for higher tuition;—that in the European states where such systems have been recently extensively matured, this principle is universally observed—there being a complete series of Universities in great towns, of Academies in provincial divisions, and of small local schools, all connected in a combined plan of instruction.” This is a correct statement of the gradation of educational seminaries, essential to a complete system;—the local, village, or small urban schools embracing “primary instruction” of different grades for the mass of the people;—the Academies, grammar schools, ~~burgh~~ *burgh* schools, or gymnasia, embracing “secondary instruction” of different grades, for the middle, or more respectable manufacturing, trading, or agricultural classes—instruction, which itself may amount to a liberal education, and include all that such classes may require; or which may prove preparatory to the more advanced requirements of the learned professions;—the Universities, embracing “higher instruction,” of different grades, for the highest classes of society, as well as for all who make literature, philosophy, science, or theology a professional study. It is true also, that, in Prussia, France,

and other continental kingdoms, the perfect organization of such connected parts in "a combined plan of instruction" is a matter of *recent* date. But it is not less true that in other more highly favored lands such organization is *not of recent* growth—that nearly as complete an organization of "connected parts in a combined plan of instruction," was perfected and frumed in Scotland about *three hundred years ago!*—having been formally presented in 1560 "to the great Councill of Scotland now admitted to the regiment, by the providence of God, and by the common consent of the Estates thereof," and perseveringly pressed upon a reluctant parliament and a mercenary nobility till its main provisions were ultimately adopted and ratified,—though never in the perfect integrity of the great, wise, and all-comprehensive original plan. And by whom was a scheme so noble—a scheme, so greatly in advance of the general spirit and intelligence of the age—a scheme, so singularly anticipative of those measures which, after nearly three centuries of reformation and civilization, have earned for certain European nations, not so much the praise of enlightened policy, as the renown of actual invention and discovery, in the department of Educational Economics? Surely it must have been the product of the joint wisdom of far seeing statesmen and politicians!—those men of clear heads, kind hearts, and liberal principles, from whom alone has ever issued any measure of large and comprehensive policy!—Alas for the oracle which has lately opened its vacant mouth wider than usual—challenging us to forgive its flippancy and obstinacy in sheer pity of its sage-like ignorance!—The very men who opposed and resisted this ever-memorable scheme of universal national education were the leading statesmen and politicians of the realm! Who then were they, who could have been its authors? "Whoever they *might* be," replies the oracle, "it is impossible that they *could* have been *ecclesiastics*—since these, by education, creed, and habit, are sectarian and bigotted—and *all* history proves that from them no scheme of comprehensive policy has ever emanated." Alas! again, for the posthumous fame of the expiring oracle;—whoever desires to see the scheme with his own eyes—a scheme of which Scotland has greater reason to be proud (if pride in any circumstances be lawful) than of all the laurels which she hath earned in the domains of literature or philosophy, of peaceful industry or patriotic war—he has only to open "the first book of the policy and discipline" of the church of Scotland, where the scheme was primarily propounded, and the propriety or even necessity of its adoption by the estates of the realm urgently and eloquently enforced!—and to

reach the climax of amazement he has only further to turn over to the title page, and there he will find it notified, that the whole was "drawn up by Mr. John Winram, Mr. John Spotiswood, John Willock, Mr. John Douglass, Mr. John Row, and John Knox," the great—the leading ecclesiastics of the nation!

Having settled that, in order to a complete system of National Education, three kinds of seminaries in India as elsewhere—Schools, Academies, and Colleges—generically distinct, though of different powers for varying degrees of primary, secondary, and higher instruction—are indispensable;—there are two or three fundamental questions which we are called on, *in limine*, to determine. 1st. What are to be the subjects taught in these institutions respectively? 2nd. Through what lingual media are these to be conveyed. 3rd. Are the whole to be attempted universally and simultaneously?—if not, on which description of them should our efforts be mainly centred and our resources mainly expended?

1st. What *subjects* ought to be taught in the different grades of Institutions? Anxious to do justice to whatever is really good in your Lordship's Minute, I shall, at this stage of my remarks, forego the consideration of the subject of *religion* altogether, *as it finds no place in your scheme of National Education*; though I must at once candidly confess that to devise and establish a national system of education without religion, seems to my mind much the same as to turn a majestic vessel fairly adrift on the wide ocean without a helm, or to project a planetary system into the dark void of space without a sun! Meanwhile, however, waving that all-important point, I proceed to remark that, as regards the *subjects* to be taught, there is one principle which surely ought inflexibly to regulate all our plans for improved education, viz. *that on every subject it is our duty to convey the known and acknowledged truth; and never any known or acknowledged error, as truth, or instead of truth.* Under the guidance of such a governing—such an ameliorating principle,—our books for elementary or primary schools, would *substantially* be the same as those employed in the best primary schools in Europe—including also extracts of such passages from Oriental works as might prove, at least harmless and unobjectionable. And surely no friend of India ought to undervalue the boon conferred by the introduction of such an improved series of elementary class books, even were no other good to accrue than the general supercession of those revolting Puranic legends and mythological tales which at present constitute the principal aliment of the youthful mind in the indigenous schools. This

I understand to be your Lordship's meaning and design from the observation that, in our common "district schools, we can draw little, if any aid, from existing native literature—that the books used in them should not only be correct and elegant in style, but should be *themselves of the most useful description*—and that the desire for the *new ideas and information* which will be imparted at them must be among the chief inducements to attendance." If this be the meaning and design, *so far as it goes*, the object is worthy of all commendation. The *secondary or middle schools*, or zillah station Academies, being partly perfective and terminative of the course of primary instruction, and partly preparatory to the higher curriculum of the Colleges, the subjects taught must of necessity assume the form and complexion of those materials which compose the extremes. What then should be taught in the *Colleges*, or "Seminaries of highest learning," as the alone subjects of "an advanced and thorough education?" To this your Lordship replies, in a tone of authority which is refreshing amid the quivering ballancings of other opinions, that it should be "*a complete Education in European Literature, Philosophy, and Science.*" Here at last, your Lordship has succeeded in planting your foot on a rock which neither the storms of controversy nor the floods of Orientalism will be able to shake. This was the clear-sighted resolution of your intrepid predecessor, and in simply confirming it a nobler plume has been added to your garland of honours than the laurel wreath of the conquest of Affghanistan.

2nd. The subjects to be taught being thus, in a *general* way, determined, the next grand question is, Through what *lingual media* are these to be communicated? Here too, your Lordship's judgment is *thoroughly orthodox*. Indeed,—apart from the admirably expressed caveat against over-sanguine expectations, and the equally admirable statement of some of the causes of partial or temporary failure, inevitably incident to a new, untried, and arduous though glorious enterprise,—this is the section of the Delhi Minute which reflects the greatest credit on your Lordship's sagacity, as a statesman and educationist. For the entire mass of *elementary or primary schools*, the *media of instruction* ought, beyond all debate, to be the *vernacular languages or dialects* of the different provinces. For the highest seminaries or colleges, the *medium of instruction* ought as demonstrably to be what Lord Bentinck decreed and Lord Auckland has ratified, viz. *the English language*. For the *secondary schools* or zillah Academies, that part of the studies which is *completive of primary instruction* in the case of those of the middle classes

who proceed no farther, should certainly be conducted through the medium of the vernaculars;—while a vigorous department should be opened in each for the study of English in the case of those who are candidates for promotion to the Collegiate Institutions.

The *media* of instruction have called forth more discussion and led to far greater misconceptions than the *subjects* of instruction. The latter were originally decided by the Government Committee to be chiefly; if not wholly, Oriental. But the rebuke administered so far back as 1824 by the Court of Directors tended to assuage the *Oriento-mania*. "The great end," wrote the Hon'ble Court, "should not have been to teach *Hindu learning* or *Muhammadian learning*, but *useful learning*. In establishing seminaries for the purpose of teaching mere Hindu or Muhammadian Literature, you bound yourselves to teach *a great deal of what was frivolous, not a little of what was purely mischievous, and a small remainder indeed in which any utility was concerned*?" Then followed the striking memorial on the late celebrated Rajah Ram Mohun Roy—one of the profoundest Oriental scholars of the age. It is in the form of a solemn remonstrance *against* the establishment of the Sanskrit College of Calcutta—and was characterized by Bishop Heber at the time for "its good English, good sense, and forcible arguments." In the course of his protest he thus proceeds:—"This seminary" (Sanskrit College) "can only be expected to load the minds of youth with grammatical niceties and metaphysical distinctions of little or no practical use to the possessors or to society. The pupils will there acquire what was known two thousand years ago, with the addition of vain and empty subtilties since produced by speculative men. The Sanskrit language, so difficult that almost a lifetime is necessary for its acquisition, is well known to have been for ages a lamentable check on the diffusion of knowledge; and the learning concealed under this almost impervious veil is far from sufficient to reward the labour of acquiring it. No improvement can be expected from inducing young men to consume a dozen of years of the most valuable period of their lives in acquiring the niceties of *Byakaran* or Sanskrit Grammar. For instance, in learning to discuss such points as the following; *Bhad*, signifying *to eat*; *Bhaduti*, he or she or it *eats*; query, whether does *Bhaduti*, taken as a whole, convey the meaning, he, she or it eats; or are separate parts of this meaning conveyed by distinctions of the words? As if in the English language, it were asked, how much meaning is there in the *eat*; how much in the *s*? And

is the whole meaning of the word conveyed by these two portions of it distinctly, or by them taken jointly? Neither can much improvement arise from such speculations as the following, which are the themes suggested by the Vedant:— In what manner is the soul absorbed into the deity? What relation does it bear to the divine essence? Nor will youths be fitted to be better members of society by the Vedantic doctrines, which teach them to believe that all visible things have no real existence; that as father, brother, &c. have no actual entity, they consequently deserve no real affection, and therefore the sooner we escape from them and leave the world the better. Again, no essential benefit can be derived by the student of the Mimangsa, from knowing what it is which makes the killer of a goat sinless on pronouncing certain passages of the Vedant, and what is the real nature and operative influence of certain passages of the Vedas, &c.? The student of the Nyaya shâstra cannot be said to have improved his mind after he has learned from it into how many ideal classes the objects in the universe are divided, and what speculative relation the soul bears to the body, the body to the soul, the eye to the ear, &c. If it had been intended to keep the British nation in ignorance of real knowledge, the Baconian philosophy would not have been allowed to displace the system of the schoolmen, which was the best calculated to perpetuate ignorance. In the same manner the Sanskrit system of education would be the best calculated to keep this country in darkness, if such had been the policy of the British Legislature. But as the improvement of the native population is the object of the government, it will consequently promote a more liberal and enlightened system of instruction; embracing mathematics, natural philosophy, chemistry, anatomy, with other useful sciences," &c. &c. Aroused by such united expostulations on the part of the Court of Directors, and of an influential Hindu, who was himself a brâhman, a man of learning and varied accomplishments, and who as a native could not be unduly prejudiced against the hereditary literature of his fathers—the Committee of Public Instruction resolved, through the medium of translated fragments and the instrumentality of learned Maulavis and Pandits, to graft a few scions from the European, on the Oriental stock. But the futility of the attempt to make a sickly exotic "imperfect graft of the tree of knowledge on a trunk, the heterogeneity of which, would not admit of its flourishing upon it," instead of planting "a young and flourishing tree, which might shoot out and spread its branches far and wide, while the trunk of the old system would be left

to a natural and neglected decay,"—the worse than futility of the project to secure the insertion of such grafts through the agency of labourers of the old school, whose pride and reputation, self-interest and inveterate prejudices were all marshalled in hostile array against the new and improved system of educational husbandry,—the utter dementedness of all this gradually became too conspicuous to be concealed. Hence the grand struggle which terminated in the enactment of the 7th March, 1835, in favour of *European Literature and Science, through the medium of the English language*. But, this enactment had something more to recommend it than the hopeless, hapless failure of the opposite system. Again and again was it shewn, *usque ad nauseam*, how,—in every recorded instance in which an improved literature became one of the instruments of civilization to a less enlightened people—as when Athens, "the eye of Greece," became light to Rome, the mistress of the world—when the wisdom of her sages, mellowing the strong heads and rough hearts of the Saracenic hosts, converted Damascus the capital of conquest into Bagdad the principal seat of letters—when, amid the gloom of the dark ages, the Arabic fount of learning overflowed to fertilize the barren regions of Grenada and the Western world—and when the revival of ancient letters in Italy stirred up the heart of Europe, and prepared it for the out-bursting of a mighty cataract of reformation;—how, in all these and similar minor epochs of movement and advance in the general progress of society, it was by a *direct* acquaintance with the world of new ideas, through that medium of language in which they were originally moulded, fashioned, and embodied, that the reforming impulse was communicated,—and how this impulse varied in intensity and permanence, in proportion as that *direct* acquaintance was more or less profound. So that never did the Hon'ble Court express a sounder *opinion* than when it wrote, "that the higher tone and better spirit of European Literature can produce their full effect only on those who become familiar with them in the original languages." And never has a Governor General reflected greater credit on himself than when he proclaims to the world his "entire concurrence" in that opinion—adding, as the soundest of all inferences, that he would, *therefore*, "make it his principal aim to communicate, through the means of the English language, a complete education in European Literature, Philosophy, and Science, to the greatest number of students who may be found ready to accept it at our hands."

In thus allotting to the English language its proper position in the firmament of reviving letters in India, what miscon-

ceptions have arisen, what misrepresentations have been forged ! “ Behold,” exclaim the orient sages, “ behold these Anglo-maniacs ;—how they propose to supplant all the native dialects, and force the tongues of a hundred and thirty millions of Asiatics to vibrate with nought but the accents of English foreigners ! What a chimera ! What an Utopian vision !” Yea, verily :—but the chimera and the Utopianism belong not to the friends of English education. They are only the shapeless phantoms which have sprung, by spontaneous combustion, from the phrenzied and excited imaginations of its foes. Our uniform and consistent statement has ever been, that, *while the vernaculars must form the sole media of instruction to the great mass of the people of India, the English language is the most powerful instrument, for rapidly and largely transferring the higher Literature and Science of Europe into the minds of the select few, who, by their higher qualifications, are destined to exert a commanding influence over the ordinary many.* Never have we even said—though much might be said, and said to good purpose too—that, abstractedly considered, the English language is the *best and most perfect* instrument for effecting *even this limited end* ; and never have we said that it should be *permanently* so employed.

As to the medium of higher or collegiate instruction, our representation has always been the following. Before us there is a *three-fold* choice :—1st. The vernacular dialects of India, which differ from each other as much, and many of them a great deal more, than French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese from each other. 2nd. The learned languages of India, Sanskrit and Arabic. 3rd. The English language. The *first* of these, or the vernacular dialects, have been declared to be inadequate even by the Orientalists themselves. One of the greatest of them, H. H. Wilson, Esq., whose opinion in such matters is held by many as altogether infallible, has recorded it as his verdict, that they are “ utterly incapable of representing European ideas ; they have no words wherewith to express them.” But even if they had, they have no works—no books—embodying the treasures of higher and improved knowledge. Nor is there the remotest prospect of possessing these, in sufficient quantity, either in the form of original composition or translation, for generations yet to come. By common consent, then, the choice lay between the learned languages, Sanskrit and Arabic, on the one hand, and English on the other. But what, it has been asked, What ! hesitate for a moment between indigenous languages and a foreign tongue, viewed as media for the impartation of knowledge ? The question seems plausible, but is based on a transparent

fallacy. If Arabic and Sanskrit were *living spoken* languages throughout India, we confess there might be some slight room for momentary hesitation. But this is not the case. These are no more living spoken languages in India than Greek and Latin are, in our day, in Western Europe. They are, in the strictest sense of the term, *dead languages*; and, as such, quite as much unknown to the vast majority of the people of India, as any *foreign tongue* that can be named. The subject is thus placed in a totally different light from that in which zealous Orientalists usually present it. This only accurate view of it proves to us that the choice lay, *not* between *two living spoken* languages and a *foreign tongue*, but between *two dead* languages and a *foreign tongue*;—that is, the choice actually lay, between *two unknown eastern* languages, and an *unknown western* language. The time and labor demanded of a native of India, whose vernacular tongue is the spoken dialect of his province, for mastering the *former* will be *equal to, if not greater* than, the time and labour required for the latter. In the case of Sanskrit, both time and labour will be prodigiously greater. For this we have the highest possible authority, even that of the accomplished scholar, the late Rajah Ram Mohun Roy:—"The Sanskrit language," says he, in the memorial already quoted, "is so difficult that *almost a lifetime* is necessary for its acquisition;" whereas, *almost a tithe* of an ordinary lifetime is in general sufficient to enable an intelligent native youth to master the English. But even supposing that the time and labour, in both cases, were the same, we should have still to ask, Which of the two, when once acquired, would answer the destined purpose best? That is, which of the two would form the most valuable instrument for the impartation of the enlightened literature and science of Europe? Here, at least, we need not pause for a reply. Let the native youth spend his time and strength in surmounting the difficulties of *Sanskrit*, and what amount of improved European knowledge will it convey to him? *Only a few scraps and fragments, which appear drooping like sickly exotics in a foreign and ungenial soil.* But let him expend only a fraction of the same time and toil in acquiring *English*, and is he not at once presented with the *very key of knowledge—all the really useful knowledge which the world contains?* Who then, will hesitate in affirming that, in the *meantime* and in *present circumstances*, Lord W. Bentinck decided wisely in appointing the English language, as the medium of communicating the *higher branches* of English Literature and Science, to the select youth of India? And who will venture to say that my Lord Auckland has acted with less wisdom in extend-

ing his guarantee to the continuance of English, as the *medium of higher instruction*, until the living spoken dialects of India become enriched by the copious infusion of expressive terms—the signs and symbols of new and improved ideas—and thereby ripened for the formation of a new and improved National Literature*?

* Another important view of this measure is that which arises from the soundness of its *policy*. The vast influence of language in moulding national feelings and habits, more especially if fraught with superior stores of knowledge, is too little attended to, and too inadequately understood. In this respect we are in the rear of nations, some of which we are apt to despise as semi-barbarous. When the Romans conquered a province, they forthwith set themselves to the task of “Romanizing” it; that is, they strove to create a taste for their own more refined language and literature, and thereby aimed at turning the song, and the romance, and the history—the thought, and the feeling, and fancy of the subjugated people, into Roman channels, which fed and augmented Roman interests. And has Rome not succeeded? Has she not saturated every vernacular dialect with which she came in contact, with terms copiously drawn from her own? Has she not thus perpetuated for ages, after her sceptre moulders in the dust, the magic influence of her character and name? Has she not stamped the impress of her own genius on the literature and the laws of almost every European kingdom, with a fixedness that has remained unchanged up to the present hour? And who can tell to what extent the strength and perpetuity of the Arabic domination is indebted to the Caliph Walid, who issued the celebrated decree that the language of the Koran should be “the universal language of the Muhammadan world, so that from the Indian Archipelago to Portugal, it actually became the language of religion, of literature, of government, and generally of common life?” And who can estimate the extent of influence exerted in India by the famous edict of Akbar,—the greatest and the wisest far of the sovereigns of the House of Timur? Of this edict, a functionary of the British Government remarked, about ten years ago: “The great Akbar established the Persian language as the language of business and of polite literature throughout his extensive dominions, and the popular tongue naturally became deeply impregnated with it. The literature and the language of the country thus became identified with the genius of this dynasty; and this has tended more than any thing else to produce a kind of intuitive veneration for the family, which has long survived even the destruction of their power; and this feeling will continue to exist until we substitute the English language for the Persian, which will dissolve the spell, and direct the ideas and the sympathies of the natives towards their present rulers.”

The “until,” which ten years ago pointed so doubtfully to the *future*, was sooner than could then have been anticipated, converted into an event of *past history*. And to Lord W. Bentinck belonged the honour of this noble achievement. He it was who first resolved to supersede the Persian, in the political department of the public service, by the substitution of the English, and laid the foundation for its becoming the language of record and correspondence in every other department, financial and judicial, as well as political. Having thus by one act created a necessity, and consequently, an increased and yearly increasing demand for English, he next consummated the great design by superadding the Education enactment of the 7th March 1835, which tended to provide the requisite means for supplying the demand that had been previously

3rd. The Third question proposed was, Whether the different grades of institutions, essential to a complete system of National Education, ought to be attempted universally and simultaneously?—and if not, on which description of them should our efforts be mainly concentrated and our resources mainly expended? On this wide theme my contracted limits will not permit me so much as to enter. One or two general remarks must therefore suffice. If there were adequate pecuniary resources and human agency, what philanthropist would not insist on the *whole* being commenced *at once* and *every where*? Hitherto, however, neither resources nor agency can be said to be, in the remotest degree, commensurate with the vastness of the undertaking. It is this which has really divided the sentiments of many of the best friends of India. The available means being utterly inadequate to the efficient advancement of all the different grades of instruction even in limited localities, individuals and Societies have been driven to the necessity of choosing one or other of these grades, as the special object of their patronage and support. Hence some have been all for elementary instruction, and others all for higher instruction—as the best and most effective mean of promoting the same ultimate end, viz. the general enlightenment of the people—according to their varying judgments of the nature and tendency and power of these diverse kinds of instruction, viewed as instruments of intellectual and moral regeneration. But which of these parties, *if* the means were within their reach, would not prefer having *the whole*, rather than *a part*? From a review of the present state of India, the lessons of past experience, and the history of all great national awakenings, I have never scrupled to avow my conviction, that, so far as education is concerned, if our resources in men and money be necessarily circumscribed, it is the part of sound wisdom not to expend these resources in spreading a thin volatile skim of mere elementary instructionism over the surface of a society that is corrupt to the very core; but rather, in increasing the density and volume of our instruction, and restricting

created. And these united acts did and do bid fair to out-rival, in importance, all the edicts of the Roman, the Arabic, and the Mogul conquerors, inasmuch as the English language is infinitely more fraught with the seeds of truth in every province of literature, science, and religion, than the languages of Italy, Arabia, or Persia, ever were. Hence it is that we venture to hazard the opinion, that Lord W. Bentinck's double act for the encouragement and diffusion of the English language and English Literature in the East, confirmed as it has now been by Lord Auckland, will, long after contemporaneous party interests, and individual jealousies, and ephemeral rivalries have sunk into oblivion, be hailed by a grateful and benefitted posterity as *the grandest master-stroke of sound policy* that has yet characterized the administration of the British Government in India.

it to a narrower sphere and a more *select* number, with the distinct view, however, of ultimately and more speedily reaching the *torpid and ignorant many* through the instrumentality of the *awakened and enlightened few*. This is substantially the scheme which your Lordship has advocated. And on one supposition, and *one alone*, may it be held to be substantially *right*, viz. that *the educational resources of Government cannot possibly be increased beyond the present amount—there being some plainly insuperable obstacle in the way of such increase*. This once granted, your Lordship's position is on the whole impregnable; this not granted, your Lordship's position is no more unassailable than a rampart of straw before an invasion of fire. But who *can* grant such a position? Who can admit the existence of such insuperable obstacle—such physical impossibility? Who can allow that in the Presidency of Bengal, with its revenue of *thirteen millions*, the paltry yearly pittance of *twenty-four thousand*, is all which it ought to yield to the first and greatest of national objects—the general education of the people? Who would stake the residuum of credit, which may often belong to a bankrupt character, on the distributive justice of the award, that *less than one five-hundredth part* of the revenue of an empire is a fitting proportion to be lavished in conferring the chiefest boon of civilization on the millions who, with the sweat of their brow and the labour of their hands, contribute that revenue? As things are at present constituted, money, money is the sinews of the machinery of moral not less than of physical warfare. Why then should the Indian Government not supply more adequate means, and thus raise on the plains of Asia, one monument of wise and enlightened statesmanship—more precious than whole piles of “barbaric pearl and gold,” and more lasting far than all fabrics of “marble or of brass?” The amiable author of a recent “Treatise on popular education in India” suggests that—as the Government have, within the last few years, “constituted a road fund throughout the North Western Provinces, by a subscription of one per cent. on the revenue on the part of the *revenue payers*, which exempts them from ever being called on for labourers for the repair of the high roads, and the full benefit of which is secured to the *payers*, by a rule, that allows of no appropriation of them for works beyond the precincts of the districts in which they are collected”—so, might a permanent education fund be established, proportionate to the wealth and population of each province, by “the surrender in return of one per cent. of the revenue on the part of the *revenue receivers*, for educational purposes.” Well might such a sum, or *one hundredth part* of their im-

mense revenue, be pronounced the very ~~minimum~~ amount that India—sunk, depressed, benighted India—has a *right* to expect or demand from her rulers, for securing one main ingredient of the panacea of her intellectual, moral, and social, maladies?

You write, my Lord, and you write well about the desirableness and necessity of providing elementary and other class books as preparatory to more extended instruction; but depend upon it, that, without supplying more enlarged means, all that has been written or recommended on this head must evaporate into airy bubbles—*promises without fulfilment—resolves without execution*. You are also said to have given expression to the noble sentiment, that you “would rather conquer the jungle with the plough, plant villages where tigers have possession, and spread commerce and navigation upon waters which have hitherto been barren, than take one inch of territory from your neighbours, or sanction the march of armies, or the acquisition of kingdoms.” But has it not occurred to you, that, while the great mass of the people lie steeped in the very slough of ignorance and superstition, sluggish apathy and intractable prejudice, such a glowing manifesto of your sentiments and wishes must remain but a gorgeous vision, as barren as the jungles to be ploughed, or the waters to be navigated? And has it not forced itself upon you, in your meditative and forecasting moods, that one of the most effective ways of turning the bright vision into actual realization is, to send the schoolmaster every where abroad, to scatter with no niggardly hand those seeds of new principles and ideas, which are the awakeners of latent energies, the heralds of coming change, and the precursors of a harvest of universal improvement? Often late we admired the boldness of the conception of a celebrated statesman, who, when taunted, on occasion of the last invasion of Spain by France, as to the diminution of British influence and the declension of British interests in the counsels of Europe, which that event seemed to indicate, rose up in the British Senate, and in substance made the magnificent reply:—“While others were torturing their minds on account of the supposed disturbance of the equilibrium of power among the European states, I looked at the possessions of Spain on the other side of the Atlantic; I looked at the Indies; and I called in the new world to redress the balance of the old.” What is there, my Lord, to prevent you from attempting to emulate, in a much higher and nobler sense, the magnanimous spirit of this reply? The power of calling forth adequate means for the machinery of a National Education must rest somewhere. Should your Lordship be

the depository thereof,—in the name of the millions that are cradled in penury, nursed in superstition, reared in ignorance, live in joylessness, and die in black despair, alike unknowing and unknown,—in the name of these unhappy millions we would implore you to exert it. Should it lodge in still higher quarters,—from the urgency and conclusiveness of your Lordship's representations might emanate the influence which alone would prove sufficiently potent to evoke it. In either case, should your Lordship fully awake, and arise, and brace on your armour, in successfully pleading the cause and establishing the means of true Indian enlightenment, to you might redound the glory of an achievement, the like of which has not yet been recorded in the annals of Asia ; to you might belong the transcendant honour, in reference to the future triumphs of education in the East, of being privileged to shew, that, at a time when many were upbraiding the Parent State with the diminution of influence at home, and others were racking their ingenuity in adjusting the disturbed equilibrium of its power abroad, you looked at the vast but dark dominions of Brahma on this side the great ocean ; you looked at the Indies ; and called in a new empire to redress the balance of the old.

* A. D.

NOTE.

It is but courteous and just to acknowledge the spontaneous and unsolicited favour of the *Courier* and the *Englishman*, in republishing my former letter ; as well as in attracting the attention of their readers to the subject by their own Editorial comments. On one who possesses the "*mens sibi conscia recti*"—on one who is a lover of truth and not a lover of controversy,—the commendations of friends and the strictures of opponents must fail to operate with either an elevating or a depressing influence. His grand stay and support being the testimony of his own conscience, and an assured sense of the approbation of his God, he can afford to expose himself as fearlessly to the buffetings of the "pitiless storm," as to the whisperings of the playful breezes. Least of all is such a one to be moved by the criticisms of those who are *universal* critics by profession. Though their honor and respectability forbid the license and the latitude which have always been accorded to painters and to poets, still, the diversity of ends which the conductors of public journals have to pursue, the multiplicity of opposing interests which they are called upon to adjust, the boundless variety of individual and party feelings and opinions which they are expected to consult, and, if possible, to regulate ;—all seem to demand the largest allowable license and latitude ; and in their professional exercise thereof no one has any right to complain. Be this as it may, all truly enlightened governments have ultimately yielded and legalized the liberty of the press, as conservative of right and repressive of wrong. And as no press ever struggled more manfully for its own liberty, than that of India, so none has, on the whole, ever less abused that liberty when conceded. In this respect the sentence of Sir J. C. Hobhouse must be regarded as down-

right, though perhaps in his happy ignorance of Indian affairs, unintentional calumny. As to the general average ability wherewith it is conducted no candid or capable judge can honestly say that it is beneath mediocrity; while, from time to time, articles do issue therefrom which would not discredit the columns of the ablest journal in the British empire. On the present occasion, I have no room (as some of the friends of native improvement suppose) for complaint of trespass beyond its legitimate province. Should one journalist be found to display his eminent and versatile talents in making "the worse appear the better reason," or in inditing strains of serio-comic wit and waggery, when the subject might seem to challenge the gravest discussion; or, should another exhibit his usual clear-headedness, not in distinguishing but in confounding things that differ, or pour forth the imbecilities of a garrulous old age where we might have expected at least a temporary hallucination of wisdom and common sense;—still, if professional purposes are to be answered thereby, no one has a right to complain:—it is all in the way of prescriptive privilege. Should the readiest and the coarsest instruments of attack be employed,—such as the throwing of suspicion on any statement by asserting or insinuating that it is *assumed without proof*, when in reality it no more needed proof than the fact, that Calcutta is situated on the banks of the Ganges, or the axiom, that the whole is greater than a part;—the pronouncing that to be declamation rather than reasoning, which consists in clenching still faster the nail of sound principle, which enlightened *reason* has revealed with almost the force of intuition;—the misapplying words in calling bad things by good names, and good things by bad names—honouring the cravings of an ignorant superstitious multitude with the title of citizen rights, and the gratifying of their most suicidal wishes as justice and charity—denouncing that as heat and violence, railing and extravagance, which is really nothing more than simple zeal and earnestness in the cause of God and in the promotion of the *best* interests of man; nothing more than that "sharp rebuking" of error which the real friend of truth is bound without respect of persons to administer, and that corresponding strength of language which a holy indignation of necessity inspires;—the glozing over what is substantially untrue with just enough of the semblance of truth to give it a plausible aspect, like the coiner who overspreads a piece of lead or copper, or any other of the baser metals, with so much of genuine silver or gold as may make the counterfeit pass;—the admitting, that the cause is a good one and the side chosen the right one, but neutralizing the admission by the trite remark of the dull and phlegmatic, that the *tone* is not what it should have been; as if it ^{was} *were rational*, to macadamize one's tone into an unvarying monotony on every subject, or *possible*, to shape one's tone into the taste and liking of every one, without ending by having no tone at all;—the pronouncing, as the effect of prejudiced partisanship, the advocacy of any clearly defined set of doctrines, as if perfection consisted in a rational and responsible being's not having any fixed principles of his own at all, but in his coolly holding up to view the conflicting opinions of others in the balance of indifference, while to the critic belonged a royal title of exemption from the charge of partisanship in bitterly assailing the sentiments of any of the parties according to his good pleasure, and in vehemently upholding the assumed infallibility of his own;—the skilful selecting and transposing of isolated expressions and passages, which apart from the context tend to throw a false colouring over the general views of an antagonist;—the ingenious magnifying of one, or two, or more, very subordinate points, and the concentrating upon them, in their dilated form, the exclusive attention of the reader, as if these really embodied the main points in debate;—the misreceiving or misrepresenting of the nature and tendency of an author's principles, as well as the scope and tenor of his statements and arguments, and the subsequent valorous demolition of such misconception or misrepresentation, as if it were really an annihilation of the principles, statements, and arguments ori-

glnally so misconceived, misrepresented, or caricatured :—should any or all of these, and such like blunderbusses, from the magazine of scholastic controversy, be preferred to the more finely tempered weapons in the armoury of truth and righteousness—still, no one has a right to complain ; since it is all in the discharge of a professional vocation which indisputably admits of as unlimited a resort to the arts of strategy as the profession of war.

In the present instance, I have addressed a letter to Lord Auckland condemnatory of one of his public measures,—not from any private or personal feelings of a hostile nature, as I can call God to witness that there are none such—but simply because, in my reason and conscience, I do seriously believe that that measure is *essentially wrong in principle*, and must prove *essentially injurious in practice*. There is much in the personal and official character of Lord Auckland which it is impossible not to admire—much too in his public administration which may cause his name and memory to be cherished amid the grateful thanks of a benefited posterity. But how can, how ought the admission of all this to preclude one from reprobating any special or particular measure of his, which may be seen to be fraught with mistaken complaisance, ruinous concession, and mischievous results? That the measure in question is of this description, I am more thoroughly convinced than ever from the utterly futile attempts that have been made to prove the contrary. Considerable noise and dust have, indeed been raised among some of the comparatively insignificant outworks of my position ; and a cloud of darkness has thus been made to envelope it, so as *momentarily* to shroud it from the spectator's view. But the main citadel itself has not yet been touched ; far less shaken or scathed ; and I am bold to say it will be found unassailable by the combined attacks of all this world's artillery. Secure in the impregnable strength of that citadel I do not require to sally forth and grapple with every mere skirmishing invader on the dust-covered plains :—no ; I can afford calmly to take my stand on the watch-tower of observation, and coolly to gaze at any number of allied foes expending their utmost strength and best resources on some of the petty outworks ; and when they have retired, wearied and exhausted with their fruitless effort, I can descend and quietly survey my stable ramparts with a more jubilant feeling than ever of security from danger, and of thankfulness to those, the failure of whose most vigorous assaults has only furnished new proof of the indomitable strength of that security. Here, then, are the leading or salient points, in the citadel of my strength, which may now shoot out their heads more conspicuously than ever, after the dust and smoke of mere out-work gladiatorship have, by a process of self-exhaustion, vanished away.

1st. *Up to March 7th, 1835, the open, avowed, and leading (though not exclusive) object of the British Government in India was, the inculcation of Oriental Literature and Science through the media of Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian, in the higher instruction of native youth belonging to the privileged and influential classes of Hindus and Muhammadans.* Who has presumed to gainsay the correctness of my statements on this head ? Not one.

2nd. *The great object of Lord W. Bentinck's enactment of the 7th March, 1835, was to supersede the use of Oriental Literature and Science through the media of the learned languages, in the higher instruction of native youth ; and to substitute European Literature and Science through the medium of the English language instead.* Who has ventured to call in question the truth of my representation on this head ? Not one.

3rd. *One of the two great definite measures of Lord Auckland's minute is to rescind the abrogatory clauses of Lord W. Bentinck's enactment ; and to restore Oriental Literature and Science through the media of the learned languages, in the higher education of the privileged classes of native youth, to exactly the same position of ascendancy which they occupied previous to the 7th March, 1835.* Who has dared to deny that this is a faithful announcement of the purport and design of one portion of his Lordship's Minute ? Not one.

4th. Such an act of restoration was wholly gratuitous—wholly uncalled for—either by the promptings of generosity, or the claims of justice, or the exigencies of state policy. Who has had the hardihood fairly to grapple with, or attempt to invalidate the force of any one of the statements and arguments by which this proposition was demonstrated? Not one.

5th. But not only was the act of restoration passed, without any valid grounds or reasons whatsoever in its favour; it was passed in the face and in spite of reasons of resistless cogency—reasons, the strength of which may be concentrated in the grand and notorious fact, that the Orientalism, to learn which students are hired and to teach which professors are salaried out of the revenues of the state, abounds throughout with radical errors and fatal untruths;—that these errors and untruths—things false in history and chronology, in geography and astronomy, in logic and metaphysics, in civil and criminal law, in morals and religion—are systematically inculcated on the minds of thousands of unsuspecting youth, not as the fabling fictions of poesy or the dreams of a vain philosophy, but as truths, or absolute verities, the belief of which is enforced by the overawing influence of sages and the uncontrollable authority of the gods! Now, who has ventured, except by the vulgar arts of evasion or abusive epithets, to impugn the substantial accuracy of this proposition? Not one. And if no one has, or dares, then do I challenge the whole world, on any principles of reason, or justice, or goodness, or common sense, to controvert the grand inference which I deduced therefrom, viz., THAT, FOR A GOVERNMENT, OR PUBLIC SOCIETY, OR PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS, TO EXPEND THEIR RESOURCES IN INCULCATING ON THE MINDS OF NATIVE YOUTH, AS TRUTHS—AS ABSOLUTE OR EVEN SACRED VERITIES—WHAT THEY THEMSELVES BELIEVE, AND CANNOT BUT BELIEVE, TO BE ERRORS AND LIES, IS DEGRADING, IGNOMINIOUS, SINFUL, AND CRUEL!

These then were my original positions; these are my positions still. And out of any one of them I do again challenge the whole world to drive me by any fair weapons of argument or fact, reason or principle, justice or goodness. In settling a question involving principles of such paramount importance, to talk about deferring to the opinions of blinded multitudes, is to prattle worse than nonsense. The world is not yet so desperately depraved as to conclude, without a manly protest, that opinions are to be estimated, *not by weight or intrinsic value, but by number and quantity*. As one cubic inch of gold would outweigh a thousand cubic inches of froth or chaff, and in value out-balance ten thousand times ten thousand cubic inches of the latter; so ought a single opinion, grounded on enlightened reason and sober experience, and substantiated by the authority of Revelation, to out-weight, both in *weight and worth*, all the opinions of all the blinded and superstitious multitudes in the world. As to yielding to the wishes of deluded men, so as to grant them what we know, intellectually and morally and religiously, to be *poison to their souls*, it were only an exemplification, in a way far more injurious, of the kindness of the man, who would yield to the wishes of ignorant children, when demanding a phial of tempting sulphuric acid to drink from, or a group of gaudy speckled snakes to play with! Verily the tender mercies of the men of expediency are cruel!

Lord Auckland's Minute on Native Education,

LETTER III.

Oh! for the coming of that glorious time,
When, prizing knowledge as her noblest wealth
And best protection, this imperial realm,
While she exacts allegiance, shall admit
An obligation on her part to *teach*
Them who are born to serve her and obey;
Binding herself by statute to secure
For all the children whom her soil maintains,
The rudiments of letters; and to inform
The mind with moral and religious truth.

Wordsworth,

MY LORD,

The age of *religious* policy is gone. Largely have most of our European statesmen imbibed and faithfully have they laboured to exemplify the principles of Machiavelli—that arch-apostle of expediency, who, according to the profound Schlegel, was “the first that introduced into modern and Christian Europe, the fashion of reasoning and deciding on politics exactly as if Christianity had had no existence, or rather as if there had been no such thing as a Deity or moral justice in the world.” Was it in order to prove to India and the world that you are not, in this respect, behind the anti-theistic liberality of your compeers, that your Lordship felt impelled to produce a Minute which has been already characterized as “remarkable above all, for its education without religion, its plans without a providence, its ethics without a God?” Not only are the most precious and significant of all terms in the vocabulary of human speech,—“Religion,” “Providence,” “God,”—not once introduced into the body of the Minute; but the grand and sublime realities, of which these are the verbal symbols, are *not even so much as once alluded to!* If the dissertation had been one concerning the “cultivation and growth of Cotton,” the omission might be pardonable; though even then, a truly noble and high-minded statesman would not

feel that the soundness of his reasoning was marred, or the effect of his appeal diminished, by a passing allusion to the God of Providence. But in a treatise on National Education, whose main object and design is, or ought to be, "the moulding and shaping of human souls—those centres of infinite action and inheritors of infinite existence"—studiously and systematically to omit all reference to *God, religion, and providence*, is an immensely greater paralogism than, in a treatise on National Agriculture, amid notices of cattle and wages and spades and ploughs, would be the omission of all reference to the nature and capabilities of different soils, and seeds, and seasons. But all this, you may reply, is methodism—sheer methodism—ranting fanaticism—steaming from the excited brains of ecclesiastics—fit enough for the atmosphere of a conventicle or school of sectarian bigotry;—but wholly unfit for the cabinets of Princes or the policies of State. Not so fast, my Lord; not quite so fast. Before me lie certain documents on the subject of National Education. In one of these it is declared, that "undoubtedly the subject of religion is of paramount importance in education"—that "the objects to which attention should be directed were, in the first place, religious instruction; in the second, general education; in the third, moral training," &c.—and that "the most simple rules of religion and habits of morality might be taught to children." In another, that "the school is not viewed as a means of conveying useful knowledge only, but is established as a powerful auxiliary in the improvement of morals"—that the great end of all primary instruction is, "the exercise of the social and the Christian graces"—that the great design of "the improved establishments for education" is to "arrest the progress of immorality," and that "the pure principles of Christian and social virtues may, by their means, be implanted and nurtured in the hearts of future generations"—with a prayer that they "may yield, under the divine blessing, the fruits which they seem to promise!" In a third, that "the first vocation of every school is, to train up the young in such a manner as to implant in their minds a knowledge of the relation of man to God, and at the same time to excite and foster both the will and the strength to govern their lives after the spirit and the precepts of Christianity"—that "schools must early train children to piety"—that, "in every school, therefore, the occupations of the day shall begin and end with a short prayer and some pious reflections, which the master must contrive to render so varied and impressive that a moral exercise shall never degenerate into an affair of habit"—and that "all the solemnities

of schools shall be interspersed with songs of a religious character!" In a fourth, that such a one is "too enlightened a statesman to think that true popular instruction can exist without moral education, or popular morality, without religion"—that "popular education ought therefore to be religious, that is to say, Christian; for there is no such thing as religion in general; in Europe, and in our day, religion means Christianity; let our popular schools, then, be Christian; let them be so entirely and earnestly"—that "we must lay the foundations of moral life in the souls of our young masters, and therefore we must place religious instruction, that is, to speak most distinctly, Christian instruction, in the first rank in the education of our normal schools." Who will deny that these are very strong and emphatic assertions as to the *necessity of religion forming a primary and integral part of any general system of education*? But who are the assertors?—Are they Ecclesiastics, who, by education, creed and habit, are sectarian and bigotted—constituting a narrow educational sect of their own? No such thing. The first extract is from the speech of Lord John Russel, the ministerial leader of the House of Commons, in February 1839, when propounding the views of the British Cabinet on National Education. The second, from the regulations of the Government of the Hague respecting public instruction in Holland, over which department for years presided the Baron Falck, one of the profoundest statesmen in Europe. The third, from the educational laws of the Prussian Government, chiefly compiled under the direction of the celebrated Baron Von Altenstein. The fourth, from the official recommendation of Victor Cousin, the French Commissioner of Education, to the Minister of Public Instruction. After this, who can, with any regard to reason, consistency, or historic fact, declare that those who insist on making *religion an essential part of education* form a narrow, bigotted, educational sect?—An educational sect indeed!—An educational sect, composed of the Governments of England, Holland, Prussia and France, with all in every land who love the souls of men, and desire to promote their present and everlasting welfare! If this be an educational sect, it is, beyond all doubt, the largest and most influential in the world—in strength of numbers and of principles, vastly surpassing all other educational sects put together! And why should the Governor General of India be either afraid or ashamed of being classified in the same educational category with Lord John Russel, Baron Falck, Baron Von Altenstein, or Victor Cousin, Peer of France?

On this, as on all other practical subjects, my Lord, the true Christian has a very speedy and summary method of ascertaining the path of duty. As a framer and administrator of Law, your Lordship cannot fail to understand the *rationale* of the procedure—however you may dissent from acknowledging the standard of ultimate appeal. When the Supreme Legislative power in a state has arrived at its own conclusions as to right and wrong, and has promulgated these, in the form of statutory law, what is expected to be the duty of every loyal subject? Is it not to shape his conduct and dealings in strict conformity to the law so ordained? And if, in a case of trespass, the subject pled that he did not choose to consult the statute-book; or, if he did, that he did not choose to act in accordance therewith; as he could not bring himself to approve of its provisions;—in short, that, overlooking the existence of the statute-book altogether, or disregarding its decisions, he choose to act agreeably to the dictates of his own reason and the suggestions of his own private conscience:—what would your Lordship, as the executor of law, respond to such pleading? Would you not at once say, and would not the whole of a well-ordered community applaud you for saying, that such pleading could not be listened to or sustained or tolerated for a single moment—that such conduct had in it all the germs of disloyalty and rebelliousness—and that, were every man thus to become a law unto himself, society would be convulsed, and its stateliest bulwarks whirled into the eddies of a universal anarchy? Now, my Lord, there is in our possession another and a higher code of Legislation than any which has emanated from the Princes or Rulers of earth:—It is the Bible—the statute-book of heaven—designed in mercy by God himself, not only for directing sinful men to the fount of pardon, through the death of our adorable Immanuel, but also for the regulation and guidance of their conduct in all the practical affairs of life. Does it not then follow as a resistless inference, that all who acknowledge themselves as subjects of the heavenly King are *bound* to consult, and walk conformably to, the statute-book of His revealed will and purposes? And if any refuse to do so—preferring the counsels of their own mind and the promptings of their own inclinations—must they not be denounced and condemned as rebels and anarchists in God's spiritual universe? In a question, therefore, *so essentially practical* as that of *education*, involving as it does so many of the varied interests of time and eternity, my own resolve, for my own guidance, would be to refer at once to the Bible as the standard of infallible authority. And thence should it be proved, both by precept and example, that

the will of Heaven clearly and indisputably is, that "the fear of Lord" must be taught us, "the *beginning* of knowledge"—that "a child ought to be trained up in the way he should walk"—that all young persons, over whom we have any influence or control, should be "nourished in the discipline and instruction of the Lord"—that, as we would nurture their bodies by the two-fold process of applying wholesome medicine to remove what is noxious and of supplying wholesome aliment to strengthen the vital functions, so, should we nourish their souls by the two-fold process of administering wholesome discipline for the repression of the very first germinations of the latent seeds of evil in the heart, and of furnishing wholesome instruction which might develope, purify, and ennoble all the faculties:—should I thus succeed in satisfying myself as to what the revealed will of the omniscient God was, I could not feel at liberty to swerve therefrom, in order to meet the partizans of a god-less expediency,—no, not by a single hair's breadth—though the united clamours of a whole world lying in wickedness were raised up against me. With the authority of Heaven on my side, I could not help denouncing *Education without religion* as contrary to the will of God, and doing violence to the morally responsible constitution of man. I could not help repudiating an Education without religion—an Education, *not based chiefly, though not wholly, on religion*—an Education, not having religion for its *chief, though not exclusive, end*—as no real, no thorough, no proper Education at all. But I feel, my Lord, that in addressing you, I cannot adopt the same compendious and decisive course. From your Lordship's uniform extreme *reserve* on the subject of religion, as well as from the total absence of any of those *external* evidences by which men *ordinarily* authenticate to others their attachment thereto, I have no means of knowing whether the Bible be a book, to whose authority your Lordship would be disposed implicitly to defer; or, indeed, to defer at all. I have no certain means of knowing whether, if it happened to be named at the Council Board, it might not be even sneered at—or whether the very sound of the term "*Christianity*" might not call forth some contemptuous or scornful remark. In this case, I have no alternative but to descend to a lower platform—and to plead the desirableness and the necessity of religious instruction, as an essential part of all sound education, on grounds which admit of an appeal to principles that may be held in common.

1st. To you, as a politician and statesman, I might first appeal, on the ground of the *utter dangerousness of know-*

ledge without religion to the welfare of individuals and the stability of social order. On this subject, hear the voice of one of the most eloquent men in England:—"We admit," says Henry Melvil of Camberwell, "in all its breadth, the truth of the saying, that knowledge is power. It is power, aye, a fatal and a perilous. Neither the might of armies, nor the schemes of politicians, avails any thing against this power. The schoolmaster is the grand instrument for revolutionizing a world. Let knowledge be generally diffused, and the fear of God be kept in the background, and you have done the same for a country as if you laid the gun-powder under its every institution. There need but be the igniting of a match, and the land shall be strewn with the fragments of all that is glorious and venerable. But nevertheless, we would not have knowledge chained up in the college and monastery, because its arm is endowed with such sinew and nerve. We would not put forth a finger to uphold a system, which we believed based on the ignorance of the population. We only desire to see the knowledge of God advanced as the vanguard of the host of information. We are sure that an intellectual must be a mighty peasantry. But we are equally sure that an intellectual and a godless will demonstrate all their might by the ease with which they crush whatever most adorns and elevates a kingdom!" Ah, but this is the sentence of an ecclesiastic! True; but it is *based on the concurrent testimony of all history*. This, if my limits admitted of it, could readily be *proved*. Meanwhile, it may be refreshing to your Lordship to learn the verdict of men whose opinions never savoured of ecclesiasticism, far less, of methodism. That *religion* is absolutely necessary for the organization and maintenance of the fabric of Society, is a truth which almost all in every age, who have sounded the depths of the human spirit, in its varied wants, cravings and appetencies, have been constrained to proclaim. The acknowledgment of it is a concession which has often *been extorted* from the practical penetrative sagacity of men, who, in their own lives, gave fatal evidence that they would falsify it, *if they could*. "That religion," remarks Lord Bolingbroke, "is necessary to strengthen, and that it contributes to the support of government, cannot be denied without contradicting reason and experience both." Again, "to make government effectual to all the good purposes of it, there *must be a religion*; this religion must be national, and this national religion must be maintained in reputation and reverence." The iron-hearted Robespierre, in that ever-memorable conclave which voted that there was no God, could boldly protest against the *political*

inexpediency of the decision ; exclaiming, " If there were no God ; a wise government would invent one." Napoleon, according to the authority of a modern French statesman, was heard on one occasion to declare ;—" No society can exist without morals, and there can be *no sound morals without religion*. Hence, there is no firm or durable bulwark for a state, but what *religion* constructs ; let therefore *every school throughout the land assume the precepts of religion as the basis of instruction*. Experience has torn the veil from our eyes." Well might the hero of the French Revolution declare that experience had torn the veil from *wise men's* eyes ; seeing that it was " knowledge without religion" which prepared that mine of combustibles that exploded with the violence of a volcano, and swept over the land with more than the desolating career of a raging hurricane. But even experience, it would seem, has failed to tear the veil from the eyes of our Eastern Politicians. On the all-important subject of religion they appear to act, as if they trembled lest they should go half as far, or admit half as much, as Bolingbroke, Robespierre, or Napoleon !

2nd. Without dwelling any further on this view of the subject at present, let us pass on to another.

In obedience to the divine command, and from a comprehensive view of the wants and necessities of man, we insist upon it that children—all children, to whom God in His Providence has given us unconstrained access—should be trained up in the knowledge of God and of salvation. Here it is that those, who, in opposition to the divine command, and from a narrow view of the wants and necessities of man, would exclude such instruction from the education of youth, loudly demur. Because we so resolutely insist on the propriety and necessity of the moral and religious part of the Educational course, they heap upon us sundry epithets from the polite pages of their complimentary vocabulary. They brand us as *short-sighted, narrow-minded, bigotted*, and, above all, *illiberal*—while to themselves they appropriate the exclusive appellations of *far-seeing, large-minded, catholic, and liberal* men. Now it requires but a grain of common sense, well exercised, to perceive the fallacy of all this. Represented in its proper light, it must at once be seen that the charge ought to be reciprocated, the statement reversed. Instead of being sectarian or illiberal, we must maintain that in its highest and best sense, the advocates of moral and religious instruction, and these alone, are truly catholic—truly liberal. We must, conversely, maintain that, in its bitterest and severest sense, these oppositionists, and these alone, are truly sectarian—truly illiberal. Now for

the proof:—The subject before us is *the education of the young*. Without dwelling on a *name*, the very sound of which has magic charms for some, and the very echo of whose sound is like the hoarse murmur of some gaunt spectre in the ears of others, we may simply ask, What is the true and proper import of the term *education*? What is it, except, what its very etymology fully implies, a name for the act of *educing*, *bringing out*, or *drawing forth* into visible manifestation any powers or principles whatsoever that may be dormant or concealed—and the bestowing upon these, when so manifested, that direction which is suited to their nature, and to the design of their being. Applied to the mind of man, what does it, rather what ought it ever to denote? What, but an *educing*, a *drawing out*, or simultaneous development of *all* those varied powers, capacities, or susceptibilities, which characterize the soul as a spiritual being, contradistinguished from sensible or material existences; and a guiding and directing of these, when so developed, to the fulfilment of the great ends of their being.

The question then is, what are the powers, capacities, or susceptibilities of the human soul? To render the charge of partiality impossible, we ask the reader to look—not to any of those works which, by some, might be repudiated as savouring of methodism—but simply to look at the standard writings of the most approved authors on this subject, for a reply;—the writings of our greatest masters in the Baconian school of mental science—the writings of our Lockes, and Reids, and Stewarts, and Browns. How do they, on the grounds of a rigid inductive philosophy, spread out before us, the map—the geographical chart—if we may use the expression—of the human mind? Under different denominations, such as the *understanding* and the *will*, the *intellectual* and the *active* powers, the *mental* states and the *emotions*, do they not emphatically assure us, that the powers and faculties of the mind must be divided into *two* great classes, that are not only specifically but generically distinct? For the sake of convenience, these two distinct classes may be briefly termed—the *intellectual* and the *moral*. To the former belong memory, imagination, reason, and all other *mental* powers. To the latter, belong love, joy, hope, veneration, and all other emotions, desires, and longings,—the aggregate of which constitutes the *moral and religious* nature of man. What, then, in reference to the human mind, can be meant by a full, complete and liberal *education*? What can—what ought—to be meant, except an education, which aims at *bringing out*, or developing, and regulating *all* its powers, by the systematic direction of *all* of these to their proper objects? Is this, then,

the aim of those who are so vauntful in their exclusive professions of *liberality*? No; no; quite the reverse. By confining themselves wholly to *secular* instruction, they address *chiefly*, and for the most part, *only*, the *intellectual* portion of man's being. In other words, they fixedly resolve to bring out or develope only *a half*, or rather a *fraction*,—and that the least important half or fraction,—of the powers and faculties of the human soul? Call ye *this*, liberality, in its true sense of bountiful and generous fulness? Nay; it is the grossest and most ruinous illiberality. We, on the other hand, would come forward and resolve to address, not a half, not a fragmentary portion, but *the whole* of man's spiritual being? The *intellectual* powers and faculties we would resolve to develope, direct, and cultivate as thoroughly as the *merely* secular educationists ever can. We would, at the same time, resolve simultaneously to address the other and more important portion of man's spiritual being. We would resolve, in humble dependance on the divine blessing, to develope, cultivate, and regulate all the *moral* and *religious* powers and susceptibilities of man. Call ye *this*, illiberality? Nay; it is liberality in its largest, most godlike sense. The purely secular educationists, in this only just view of the subject, are demonstrably the narrow-minded, the parsimonious, the sectarian, the illiberal, because their system of education is at best but a *half* or a *fractional* system—which, under the false pretence of liberality, would rob a man of the due development and right use of the best half of his soul's capabilities. Those, on the other hand, who insist on blending secular with moral and religious instruction, are as demonstrably the large-minded, the bountiful, the catholic, the truly liberal, because their system of education is a whole, or integral system—embracing as it does, and endeavouring to develope, and direct *all* the powers and susceptibilities of the human soul. The *former*, to whatever extent followed out, never can, in the nature of things, go beyond a species of *meagre demi-education*. The *latter*, followed out to its legitimate extent, and that alone can ever constitute a *really comprehensive and complete education*—leading out all the powers of the soul so as to include, without being unduly absorbed by, the interests of time—bracing them to resist the pelting of the storms of life—and causing them to send up lively shoots towards the heaven of heavens.

3rd. Not only is the exclusively secular scheme, now impugned, partial and illiberal; but even in *perfectly* attaining its own professed objects, it must prove *utterly inefficacious*.

Let us illustrate this by a parallel representation. Suppose a large district of country, still in a wilderness state, is to be

brought under cultivation. Below, are extended plains, bestrewn with marshy swamps; above, are towering eminences mantled with waving forests. The colonists, instead of simultaneously draining the marshes that stagnate beneath and clearing the forests that wave on high, direct *all* their efforts exclusively to the latter. What is the natural—the necessary result? No sooner have the sloping declivities and the elevated table lands begun to exhibit symptoms of fruitfulness calculated to inspire the most animating hopes, than the noxious exhalations borne from beneath on the wings of the wind, smite the husbandmen with pestilential fevers, and their crops with blighting mildew. Human life is thus deprived of more than half its enjoyment, and the soil denuded of more than half its fruitfulness. Whence the cause of so disastrous an issue? It is wholly attributable to the system of *half cultivation*! If the colonists, instead of exclusively confining their labours to the upper regions, had *cotemporaneously* applied their resources to the draining of the fens, bogs and marshes, in the valleys below,—they would have desiccated the reservoirs of noxious exhalation—they would have preserved the health of the labourers, and been enriched with the full,—the unblighted—produce, of the upper fields. Yea more, they would have more than doubled that produce by the rich accession of the luxuriant returns of the plains below.

Precisely parallel is the case with the husbandry, or what the great father of modern philosophy, has significantly termed “the Georgics of the mind”—the immortal soul being the soil, the skilful teacher the instrument of culture, the Father of spirits the Husbandman. Here we have to deal practically with *two* great divisions—the *intellectual* and the *moral*—bearing a striking analogy to the two great divisions of an unreclaimed territory. Sin hath entered into both. Sin has blinded the understanding and vitiated the judgment, and all kindred powers. But it is in the moral department, that sin has committed the most frightful ravages—converting that once most fertile region into an unsightly morass of evil passions, appetites, and desires,—the most loathsome and abominable. Now, how do the secular educationists set about the process of cultivation? They propose to cultivate, what they reckon the upper, the superior, or intellectual department; *and that alone*. Can they *fully* succeed in the *exclusive* attempt? Impossible. By neglecting altogether the moral, which they reckon the inferior, but which in reality is the richer and more fertile department, of the two—there will, in *most cases*, speedily ascend such noxious fumes from indulged passions,

unbridled appetites, and uncurbed desires, as must becloud, darken, and paralyse all the intellectual powers—thus rendering the cultivation of them, in a great measure abortive ; and the legitimate products of them, nought but a blighted harvest. Or if—in cases where the equilibrium of the mental faculties is disturbed, by the presence of some one of preponderant force,—full scope be given to the predominant power, at the expense of all the rest, they may succeed in making one, all memory ; and another, all imagination—one, a great metaphysician ; another, a great astronomer ;—but assuredly they never will—they never can—by such unequal and disproportionate development, succeed in making, a *great man*. Failure, failure, failure, must thus be emblazoned on the standard of every enterprise in *mere* intellectual husbandry. How different *our* proposed method of procedure ! Availing ourselves of *all* the instrumentalities put within our reach, whether connected with Jehovah's works or Jehovah's word, we would resolve at once, in humble reliance on His omnipotent grace, to carry on simultaneously a double process of cultivation, in the two great departments of our intellectual and moral nature. And when, through the divine blessing on the means employed, the fruits of righteousness have been made to spring forth from the reclaimed heart and purified affections, then will the intellect, no longer tainted by the foul breath of appetite and passion, expand itself, with unchecked freedom, and in the fairest and stateliest proportions—exhibiting to all around the bloom and the fruit of sanctified intelligence. This, this, is the natural, the noble result of the scheme of double culture, which, in obedience to the divine command, we would purpose to pursue—a scheme, which promises to realize, in a far higher degree, the intellectual expansion exclusively aimed at by the secular educationists ; while, it equally promises to realize, by God's blessing, all the grandeur and dignity of that moral and religious culture which is aside from their aim, and utterly beyond the reach of their attainment.

4th. Suppose the *great end* of the secular educationists could be attained—as fully attained it never can be, if *exclusively* pursued—it were *comparatively* but a *poor and a drivelling end*. To aim at the *exclusive* cultivation of man's intellectual powers by the presentation of objects unconnected with morals or religion—objects, that are temporal, sensible, visible, perishable, is to treat him at once with cruelty and contempt. It is to treat him purely as a creature of time and of sense. It is to deal with him on the same physical utilitarian principle that we would with some tractable animal, or beast of burden, which we wished to rear for some humble but necessary drud-

gery. It is to attempt to fit him to play his part profitably on the stage of time, and then leave him to expire miserably like the brutes that perish. It is practically to shape, fashion, and handle him like any other temporary machine ; as if his soul's immortality were a lie, and heaven and hell nothing better than the wildest inventions of heathenism, or the idlest fictions of the poetic muse.

Questionless, it is our bounden duty to do what we can for the *temporal* as well as the *spiritual* improvement of man. In this respect, we have always been ready to give the most unbounded credit to all who labour for the promotion of so excellent an end. If, for example, it has been found that, in this land, to the incalculable detriment of man's temporal welfare, any public revenues, have been largely expended in maintaining schools or colleges for the study of such works, as abound throughout with radical errors and fatal untruths—largely expended, in actually “ hiring students to learn and professors to teach what is notorious false in history and chronology, in geography and astronomy, in logic and metaphysics, in the principles of civil and criminal jurisprudence—enforced as all these instructions have generally been, by the overawing influence of sages, and the uncontrollable authority of the gods ! ”—who could hesitate to defend and vindicate any resolution, with whomsoever it should originate, to dispense with such pernicious works altogether in the instruction of native youth—and the determination to substitute in their place, any others, which should be characterized by their purity of sentiment and plenitude of discovery, in every department of literary and scientific research ? But highly as we do and must approve of *such* resolution, by whomsoever formed or adopted, *so far as it goes*, how can we scruple,—in justice to our own views, in justice to the noblest cause on earth, in justice to the souls of men—how dare we scruple, to express our honest conviction that it *does not go far enough* ?

Truth is better than error in any department of knowledge, the humblest as well as the most exalted. Hence it is that we cannot but admire the moral intrepidity of any man, who, armed with the necessary power, would direct that in any of the leading institutions of this land, true literature and true science should be substituted instead of false literature and false science. But while we would rejoice at the substitution of the true instead of the demonstrably false in these important branches of useful knowledge, how could we but lament, should no provision whatever be made at the same time for introducing the best and noblest of all useful knowledge—the

knowledge of the only true religion—Christianity—in place of the false religion which our literature and science, when successfully cultivated, must inevitably demolish? We are aware that certain plausible views of worldly expediency, and certain admitted peculiarities in our position in India, *seem to forbid*, under any modification, the *direct* communicating of a knowledge of Christianity to our native fellow subjects. Into such views however, we could never enter. Our firm belief, confirmed by growing experience is—that, whenever our own internal fears, acting as traitors, do not, by some species of metempsychosis, transform themselves into imaginary external foes—that, wherever there is the *will*, means may always be devised that would obviate *all reasonable—all genuinely honest*—objections. But be this as it may, we cannot—even in reference to temporal improvement—we cannot, help regarding the absence of all provision for affording, to those who might desire it, an opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of Christian truth, in any of our Indian Government institutions, as a grand omission,—a capital deficiency. If man had been destined only to “strut his little hour” on the stage of time, and then drop into a state of non-existence, it might be enough to attempt, however inadequately, to provide for the interests of time. But the case is widely different, when reason and revelation alike constrain us to view him, as destined to be an inhabitant of eternity—an inheritor of never-ending bliss or never-ending woe. Surely, in this only true view of man’s destiny, it is an anomalous philanthropy after all, that can expend the whole of its energy in the attempt to bedeck and garnish him to play his part well on the stage of time; and then cast him adrift, desolate and forlorn, without shelter and without refuge, on the shoreless ocean of eternity. But we are verily persuaded, that even time can never be rightly provided for, by any measure that shuts eternity wholly out of view. So inseparably connected, in the wise ordination of providence, are the best interests of time with the best interests of eternity, that one of the surest ways of providing aright for the former, is to provide, thoroughly and well, for the latter. Our maxim, accordingly has been, is now, and ever will be this :—*Wherever, whenever, and by whosoever, Christianity is sacrificed on the altar of worldly expediency, there and then, must the supreme good of man lie bleeding as its base!* The question then is not, Whether it be good, in any case, real or supposed, to remove so much of the rubbish which had for ages been accumulating around the temple of eternal truth, in this—superstition’s own peculiar realm? No:—the real question

is, Whether it is good, in *any* circumstances, to resolve to stop here? Whether it is good to stop, where the learner must be left blindly groping, in ignorance of the higher ends of his being, and the destiny that awaits him when time is no more? Whether it is good to resolve to leave the intellectually educated youth of India, to linger in pain and weariness around the threshold of created things, when there is a free and welcome invitation to enter the temple itself, and be enrapt in admiration of its beauteous symmetry and perfect forms; and inhale, with reviving freshness, the full breath of love and joy and goodness, direct from the countenance of him, who presides over the spacious fabric and irradiates it with all its glory? The grand question is,—seeing that man is destined to be the denizen of an eternity that must be provided for, in order to prevent its being an eternity of woe,—Whether it be good, or kind, or generous to dole out to him a scanty provision, but barely and inadequately suited even to the wants of time,—Whether it be good, or kind, or generous, thus to attempt to feed the immortal soul with nought but the garbage of mere secular knowledge, which has no reference whatever to the wants of a boundless duration beyond the grave? Surely, surely, this is nothing better than the vain, the foolish, the mad attempt:—

To satisfy the ocean with a drop,
To marry immortality to death;
And with the unsubstantial shade of time,
Fill up the embrace of all eternity.

Seeing, then, that the voice of reason, the voice of philosophy, the voice of experience, and the voice of God alike unite in proclaiming that moral and religious instruction, (i. e. as even Victor Cousin, Peer of France, would say, *Christianity*, since, "*in our day, religion means Christianity.*") is essential to any course of education that is *worthy* of the name, I would leave your Lordship for a moment, and address myself to all in this land who fear God, and are not ashamed of glorying in the cross of Christ—as the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. Fellow Christians, on you, in the matter of training and educating the young, has been laid the command of your God and Saviour. How can ye, then, without an act of daring rebellion, hesitate for an instant as to the path of duty? How can ye hesitate between the obligation of yielding allegiance to the King of kings, or of yielding deference to the suggestions of his adversaries? How can ye halt between the infallible decisions of heaven, and the fluctuating maxims of a selfish

carnal expediency? Amid the great herd of timorous, cowardly, world-conforming professors of the faith of Jesus in this land, surely there are some, lurking it may be in secret places, who have not formally bowed the knee to Baal. To you, dearly beloved brethren, whatever be your country, your denomination, or your colour,—to you do I now specially appeal. You *know* that the mighty and the only effectual instrument of light and liberty to a benighted and enslaved world is the Bible—the revealed—the infallible word of the living God. You know that the mighty, the only effectual Agent in bringing home that word with power into the darkened understandings; the depraved hearts, and the seared consciences of sinners, is the omnipotent Spirit of all grace. You know the plenitude of Jehovah's mercy and loving kindnesses. You know the infinite fulness and freeness of the great salvation wrought out by an Almighty Saviour. You know that, whosoever asketh shall receive, whosoever seeketh shall find, whosoever knocketh, to him shall the door be opened—yea, that whosoever *will*, is invited to come and take of the water of life freely, without money and without price. You know that in proclaiming such glad tidings of great joy which are unto all people, the Lord hath been pleased to appoint and employ the agency of *apostolic*, that is, of *pardoned*, *justified*, and *regenerated* men, qualified by natural and acquired endowments, and especially by the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit. And you know that by their counsels, their examples, their contributions and their prayers, *all* true believers are invited to partake of the privilege of being *fellow-workers* with God himself in carrying on the mighty scheme of Redeeming Love. To share in this honour, therefore, do I now urgently invite you; to share in the greatest luxury of which pure spirits on earth can possibly partake—the luxury which the divine Redeemer so highly prized—the luxury of doing good to the souls of men. By soliciting your aid in promoting the temporal and eternal interests of your Indian fellow-subjects, we invite you to assume towards them the aspect and the attitude of a God-like philanthropy. We invite you virtually to address them, saying, “Men and brethren, our heart's desire and prayer to God for you is, that ye may be saved. Our heart's desire and prayer to God is, that we may be instrumental in furthering your temporal, and, above all, your eternal welfare. And, even if ye will persist in spurning our proffered aid; if ye will not allow us to be your friends, we are at least determined not to be your enemies, by practising upon you any cheat or imposture in the name of a hollow carnalizing expediency—by pandering to the ignorance, the vanity, or the

pride of poor, sinful, degraded humanity—or by lending our countenance to schemes and projects which only tend to deceive you to your eternal undoing. No, our heart's desire is to confer upon you the largest amount of benefit of which fallen humanity is susceptible. And even if ye will violently resist, and oppose, and calumniate, we shall not be tempted, with similar weapons, to retaliate. Oh no; not having so learned Christ, we shall only be filled with pity and compassion on account of your ignorance and blindness. We shall only be driven to retire, and mourn over your infatuation and folly. Whatever interested deceivers may allege, *our* object is that of the purest, most tender benevolence. You long for worldly riches:—And since the rapidity, with which these take wings unto themselves and flee away, should convince you that there is no security *there*, we desire to point out how ye may earn true riches—spiritual treasures,—to be laid up in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, nor thieves break through to steal. You aim at earthly power:—And since the fleeting nature of its tenure should convince you that there is no stability *there*, we desire to point out how ye may obtain divine power—power, to mortify what is evil and cultivate what is good—power, to raise you from the dunghill of earth and seat you on thrones of glory for evermore. You aspire to the honours which come from men:—We desire to direct you to the acquisition of enduring honours—honours which shall ennoble you among the hosts of the celestial hierarchies. You strive to be admitted into the society and friendship of the great and the mighty of the land:—We desire to shew you, how ye may be exalted to become the companions of angels and the friends of the most high God. You labour after worldly fame and reputation which, like the breath of a vapour, soon passeth away:—We desire to shew you, how ye may obtain a name which shall outlast the grave, survive the final conflagration, and flourish amid the plaudits of eternity. Or, have you to struggle on, through the desert of life, amid hunger and thirst and toil and weariness? Yonder, are green pastures and an eternal spring. Are you buffeted with neglect and insult and contempt and scorn? Yonder, are songs of praise and triumphant hallelujahs, the very echo of which were enough to inflame the sluggish spirits of the sons of earth. Have you to encounter pains and sickness and the agonies of death? Yonder is the river of life—the river of God's pleasures—of which ye may be privileged to drink, and drink for evermore.”

And if these, my fellow Christians of every name, if these constitute but a dim and faint portraiture of the rich inheritance, which, by your contributions and your prayers, we

invite you to proffer in the name of your God and Saviour, to the perishing multitudes of this benighted land ;—tell me, if in thus urging them to become supremely happy ; and in pressing upon them the only means of attaining to the highest felicity which earth or heaven can supply ;—tell me, oh tell me, if you are not in reality invited to earn for yourselves a title to be hailed, as their best, their noblest, their most disinterested benefactors ?

My Lord, for the present, I have done. Throughout, I have adressed you with the freedom of a British subject, and the fearlessness of a citizen of Zion. To you, as the respected Head of the British Government in India I owe, in all things civil, an implicit, an absolute allegiance. “ Honour and obey the king, as supreme,” is one of the clearest and most peremptory commands in God’s holy oracles. And never do I lose a favourable opportunity of enforcing, on all around me, the duty and necessity of rendering to “ the powers that be” all due honour and obedience. Should the exigencies of the state ever require the services of one so feeble and unworthy, speak but the word, and the sacrifice neither of time nor of comfort, neither of health nor of life itself would for a moment be grudged or withheld. But, my Lord, there is another precept quite as clear and if possible, still more peremptory. That precept is, “ Fear God and obey Him,” yea, “ Obey God rather than man.” And it is, not in my capacity as a subject of the British Crown, but in my higher capacity as a subject of the Heavenly Kingdom, that I presume, on the present occasion, to impugn one of your Lordship’s Educational measures—affecting, as that measure indisputably does, the vital interests of the latter, far more than the interests of the former. Nor is it at the bar of a godless “ public opinion,” or an equally godless “ worldly expediency ;” neither is it before the tribunal of Imperial Parliaments that I now impeach that most anti-christian measure. No ! It is at the bar of universal *reason*—reason, sanctified, expanded, and illumined by the sunshine of revelation—that I boldly prefer my bill of indictment. *There*, accordingly, would I now arraign your Lordship, and your Councillors and Secretaries, and other members of the Public Instruction Committee—and *there*, would I charge you all as *spiritually* guilty in your Education Schemes ;—guilty of what looks like treason against the Majesty and Sovereignty of the God of Providence—guilty of the cruelest wrong to the souls and immortal destinies of thousands of your Indian native fellow-subjects. For the substantial justice of the charge I appeal—not to the religious public of Great

Britain alone—but to the recorded verdicts of the Russels of England, the Cousins of France, the Falcks of Holland, the Altensteins of Germany; and all the greatest and most celebrated statesmen of ancient and modern times! And in conclusion I would—in the name of God, the Father of mercies, the Almighty Spirit of all grace, and the Divine Redeemer of the world—most solemnly beseech and adjure you to review and amend your fatal decision;—as you have to answer for it at the bar of final Judgment before an assembled universe,—on that dread day, when “the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, shall hide themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and cry to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?”

A. D.

NOTE.

As I do not intend to pursue the subject any farther through the present medium, a few additional remarks must bring it to a conclusion.

1st. On the subject of “citizen rights” there are afloat, in certain quarters, the strangest and most unaccountable notions. The existence of such rights in the abstract, and the title to exercise such as, by the common reason and consent of mankind, are readily acknowledged to be rights, no morally sane person has ever denied. But, should certain things be called “rights” which in reality are not “rights;” surely the repudiating of such *falsely called rights* can never be construed by any morally sane person as equivalent to the *denial of all rights whatsoever*; or to a contemptuous disparagement of such rights as are *really worthy* of that honoured name. Rights are of different kinds—natural and acquired—personal and public—and so forth. Now, I do not deny, for example, the absolute personal right which any man in Calcutta, whether European or Native, has to dispose of *his own* money in purchasing the party-coloured habiliments of a harlequin or merry-andrew; neither do I deny his absolute personal right to exhibit himself, thus arrayed, in the performance of fantastic tricks, for the amusement of his fellow-citizens. But surely, were he to come to me and *demand* of me, *as a right*, a portion of my money, to help him in making his buffoonish purchase, or in maintaining him while voluntarily devoting his time to the entertainment of idlers and loungers;—surely I should not be wrong in denying that he had *any right whatever to make such a demand at all*; I should not be wrong in denying that he had any right whatever to ask me to contribute of my resources to enable him to make himself and others greater fools than before. In like manner, I never did, never will dispute the absolute personal right (under responsibility to God) of my native fellow-subjects to teach what they please among themselves, or to learn what they please among themselves, connected with *their own* systems of Literature, Philosophy, and Religion—however foolish or frivolous, injurious or false, I might believe these systems to be. But should these come to me or to any other party away from themselves, and *demand*, as a *right*, a portion of our resources to enable *them* to teach and to learn *their own* systems

—systems utterly repugnant to the genius and spirit of *our own*—would I be wrong in denying that they had any right whatever to make the demand? Would I be wrong in smiling at the foolery of any man who might childishly fancy that any such right existed at all? And the principle of the case is not one whit affected by the hypothesis that the party on whom the demand is supposed to be made is the Government. Are not the revenues contributed for the stability of the state and the general welfare of the community? And is the Government to be deprived of all free-agency and responsibility in judging of what is most conducive to both ends? Surely not. Its duty, as the great central, regulating, arbitrating, and controlling power, is to deliberate and adjudicate in every case according to principles of reason, justice, and benevolence—always to concede to the *reasonable* wishes of its subjects, but never to yield to idle, ignorant, or prejudiced clamours—always to maintain *clear and established rights*, but never, to the injury of all parties, to confound such rights with the figments of depraved tastes or vitiated imaginations.

2nd. It has been again and again asserted that the “majority of the natives” are crying out for the instruction conveyed in the Oriental Colleges. With far greater truth it might be said that the “majority of the people” of Great Britain are crying out for that higher education in our home universities which is conferred on candidates for the learned professions. What a delusion! As regards the Hindus—constituting the great bulk of the people—it is only *one class of them*, viz. the *bruhmanical*, which practically has access to the Sanskrit Colleges. In Bengal, the next two classes can scarcely be said to exist. The fourth, or Sudras, and outcastes, of which the *great mass of the people* consists, have never, except in a few isolated cases, signified any desire, and possess little or no leisure for a learned Sanskrit education; or, if they did, they are, on account of their caste, by *sacred Hindu law* and *immemorial prescriptive usage*, utterly precluded from attending the Sanskrit Colleges! What urrant nonsense, then, is it to say that the majority of the people of India are clamorous for instruction in that higher species of Orientalism, with which *alone* Lord Auckland's Minute, or my letters, have to do? Of late too, not a whisper was heard, not a movement was observed, even among the *small minority of the privileged class*, towards the restoration of the lapsed funds on the part of Government, No:—wherever English education has had sufficient time to cause itself to be appreciated, the natives, who excel in worldly shrewdness and sagacity, begin to manifest no insignificant symptoms of their *willingness* to pass by their own, and to *naturalize and nationalize* the nobler Literature and Science of Europe. In this respect, Calcutta has had the longest time for the experiment. Now, in 1831, in the official report of Government, the attendance is reported as follows:—

<i>Sanskrit College.</i>	<i>Hindu (or English) College.</i>
30 Pupils at (stipends of) 8 rupees.	Pay boys (5 rupees each),..... 300
70 Ditto at ditto 5 rupees.	Free ditto, 60
60 Free scholars.	School Society, 30
	Donation scholars, 12
160	402

At the end of 1835.

<i>Sanskrit College.</i>	<i>Hindu College.</i>
135,	407,
Mostly stipendiary.	Of whom 347 pay for their education.
	At the end of 1838.

<i>Sanskrit College.</i>	<i>Hindu College.</i>
129,	474,
Of whom 49 were stipendiary, and 80 free scholars.	Of whom 56 were foundation students, and 415 pay for their education from five to seven rupees per month.

Let any man of common sense weigh this side and that—and then say to which the prevailing taste of the native inhabitants of this great metropolis decidedly leans! So much for the most unfounded saying that the majority of the natives prefer and cry out for learned, and, to them, inaccessible Orientalism!

Another test of the nature and direction of the current of native taste and feeling, founded on the School Book Society's operations, may well be appealed to. These books "are sold to any body who chooses to purchase them, and the proportions in which they are disposed of, shew the relative demands which exists for the different kinds of learning." At the close of 1839, the Society's own comparative statement of the sales of the four preceding years is as follows :—

English,	72,205	Books.
Bengali,	20,363	
Anglo-Asiatic,	9,520	
Hindui,	9,684	
Hindustani,	7,445	
Persian,	2,869	
Uriya,	551	
Sanskrit,	620	
Arabic,	110	

This enumeration is altogether *exclusive* of the many valuable English publications that constantly issue from the fertile Press of Serampore; as well as of those sold at different private establishments in Calcutta. From the School Book Society's Depository, there issued, in the 4 years 1836-7-8-9, in the *two learned* languages of Orientalism, only 930 works!—*Arabic*, 110; *Sanskrit* (believed to be the very language of the gods) 620!—While, in the *English* language, there is a sale of 72,205!—That is, the real actual *voluntary* demand for *English* works is about a HUNDRED TIMES GREATER than the real actual voluntary demand for the works of Orientalism in *Sanskrit and Arabic* united! So much again for the luckless assertion that the majority of the natives are clamorously in favour of their own learned Orientalism!

3rd. On the subject of religion, Lord Auckland's Minute is not only altogether *defective* as regards the *true*, and altogether *wrong* as regards the *false*; it is wholly *inconsistent* with his Lordship's professions and avowed principles in other respects. He belongs to that school of Liberals, whose boast constantly is that of *rigid neutrality* and *strict non-interference* in matters of religion. Now, what is it, in reference to the *false and degrading religion of Orientalism*, that might be styled an attitude of *real neutrality* or *non-interference*? Would it not be something like this?—"You, the natives of India, shall enjoy perfect toleration in the profession of your faith; you may teach it and practise it just as you please. So long as you do not, under the mask of religion, perpetrate crimes against the peace and well-being of society, we shall let you alone. Not believing in it ourselves, we cannot on the one hand, *actively* support it by our influence or our pecuniary resources; but having no warrant, on the other, to treat it with violence, we can never employ coercive measures of any kind against it. If we interpose at all, it will only be, by dealing with you, as rational and responsible beings; it will only be by the use of the legitimate weapons of knowledge, persuasion, and argument. Thus we shall neither directly patronize or support your religion by our resources; neither shall we attach to the profession of it, any pains or penalties." Now, this would be to act towards the religion of the natives, on an intelligible and consistent principle of rigid neutrality or non-interference. But how does my Lord Auckland act? He steps forward, and in the face of the most cogent reasons, he *re-endows the religion of Orientalism* out of the revenues of the state, to the extent of the available means. He gives out money from the public treasury for teaching that religion, as an *integral part* of the Oriental system; and this

direct and active pecuniary support, accompanied by the influence and eclat of Government patronage, is facetiously termed, on the principle of contraries, rigid neutrality and strict non-interference! Again, what would be the lowest attitude of a fair and reasonable neutrality, as regards the true and ennobling religion of Christendom? Should it not be something like this?—"To you, the natives of India, we wish to impart for your enlightenment and civilization, the Literature and Science of Europe. 'Of that Literature and Science' the root and 'mother' is the true and pure religion of Europe; we are ready therefore to teach you that too, if you desire it. But in our English Colleges we shall not make the learning of the latter an indispensable condition of your obtaining the former. No; we shall leave you at perfect liberty to do as you please. Should you unhappily wish only European Literature and Science; such Literature and Science will be taught, without any direct or formal communication of the religion of Europe. But, should you also happily desire instruction in the latter, here is an accredited agent who, in addition to his other duties, is able and willing to instruct you. No compulsory attendance will be enacted or allowed. We exonerate our own consciences in this respect, by fairly opening up and presenting to you a favourable opportunity. But of that you are left at liberty to avail yourselves or not according to your good pleasure. You may learn or not learn precisely as your own tastes and inclinations may prompt you." This at least, would remove the stigma and the sin of the present aspect of a national disavowal of the truth of Christianity towards the natives. This too would be a real neutrality and non-interference, though of the lowest grade, towards the truth of God—the salt of the earth—the light of the world. But, how does my Lord Auckland act? In his Minute, while treating of the Literature and Science of Christendom, he passes over the religion of Christendom altogether, with as profound a silence as if it were a non-entity in the world. In the rules and regulations of the public Instruction Committee of which Lord Auckland must have approved, all teachers are "particularly enjoined to abstain from any communications on the subject of religion with the boys." Here, again, there is something worse than mere silence. Here, is a peremptory injunction, of a prohibitory character, laid on teachers. So that, *however willing or anxious boys might be* to learn something of the religion of Christendom, while acquiring the Literature and Science of Christendom; and, *however willing or anxious a qualified teacher might be*, to comply with their request:—both parties are strictly forbidden to hold any communications on the subject! The boys are neither allowed to learn nor the teachers to teach that which the God of heaven hath commanded, and which alone can truly enlighten and civilize, by truly regenerating the intellect and heart of man! And this active discouragement—this peremptory prohibition of the Christian faith, is again, by the rule of contraries, facetiously designated rigid neutrality and strict non-interference!

In worldly affairs how strange would such conduct appear? Suppose the British Government at home were to profess a rigid neutrality and strict non-interference on the subject of importing West and East India sugar into the British isles. What would the common sense of mankind say, were this profession to be practically exemplified as follows?—On the one hand, the Government say to the West India merchants, "Towards you we wish to act a neutral part; you may therefore not only import your sugar freely, without custom or other import; you may expect more. We are resolved to extend towards you active support. We are determined to grant you, out of the revenues of the State, a substantial encouragement, in the shape of a handsome bounty on every hundred-weight which you present for home consumption." So much for the Government interpretation of its own professed neutrality and non-interference towards the West India proprietors! On the other hand, the Government, address the East India merchants, saying, "Towards you too, we wish to maintain the attitude of an inflexible neutrality. Know therefore, and remember, that, under pains

and penalties for the violation of it, there is laid upon you a stern injunction *not* to introduce a single particle of East India sugar into the home market. The prohibition is absolute. He who disregards it shall be prosecuted with the utmost rigour of the law." And this is neutrality—this is non-interference—towards the East India merchants! Suppositions wild, unnatural, and incredible!—will all be ready to exclaim. And yet what are these but a perfect counterpart to the sad realities of inconsistency manifested by Lord Auckland and his coadjutors towards the false religions of the East and the true religion of the West? The former they patronize and actively support by largesses out of the public revenue! The latter they not only do not countenance at all, but actively discourage and even wholly prohibit! And yet all this egregious revolting inconsistency is perpetrated under the grossly abused designation of neutrality and non-interference! It is like the neutrality of the fountain which feeds one river; it is like the non-interference of the heat which dries up another!

4th. If any one has a doubt as to the *low grovelling ends* contemplated by the secular educationists, and the consequently *low grovelling motives* by which their exhortations are enforced, he has only carefully to peruse Lord Auckland's Minute. Throughout, it is as clear, but certainly as cold, cheerless, and barren as the nocturnal sky of an Arctic winter. Throughout, it contains not a single hearty appeal to any one noble or generous motive or principle by which the breast of man can be actuated. Throughout, it contains not a single hearty aspiration, calculated to excite one noble or generous sentiment in the human heart. The *very highest end* which it holds out to the educated youth of India is, the prospect of employment mostly in subordinate branches of the government service. The *very highest motive* to which it appeals is the ambition or desire to be qualified for such money-producing appointments. It converts the Government Institutions, in their highest estate, into so many educational foundries for casting and fabricating so many human machines to weave out the dull monotonous web of government business. It makes worldly interests, and these too of a kind not very exalted, not only the chief, but the sole end of action. It begins with earth, and ends with earth—generating for a few years vanity and secularity, the pride of learning and the pride of place—and then drops its victims into the cold arms of death without a hope, without a comfort, and without any provision for an hereafter. As men sow, so shall they reap. "He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption." He that strives to sow or implant only low, earthly, sordid motives in the youthful mind, shall assuredly reap a harvest of what is low, earthly, and sordid in the fruits or actions of after life. From the Government scheme of education, I venture to predict that a *race* of noble, generous, high-souled, disinterested, government officers will never spring. We might as well expect to gather the most beauteous flowers from inferior seed profusely scattered in the stagnant marshes of Bengal, or on the icy summits of Himalaya. On the other hand, it must be remembered that a *comprehensive* education,—or that whose *first* object is, "to instil and cherish, in dependence on the divine blessing, true religion, both in the soul, and in the daily and hourly habits of life; and whose *second* object is to convey *general knowledge* to form the mind and manners"—that even such an education will not *necessarily*, and may not *generally*, produce the high and noble results aimed at. In a country like India, and in the present transition state of its society, a general and religious education can have no fair play. The lessons and training of the school are ever apt to be counteracted by the contrary lessons and training of home. The admonitions of the enlightened teacher are ever apt to be neutralized by the maxims and the practices of a corrupt idolatrous society. And the most irrefragable demonstrations of the Theologian are ever apt to be cavalierly tossed aside by the proud shallow-minded pedants that are reared in irreligious institutions. Besides, the best conducted religious education, under the most favourable circumstances, will not, cannot, *of itself*, make men religious, i. e. saturated with the love of God and the love of man. Nei-

ther, as has been well said, "will the preaching of the gospel make men pious. The Bible itself will not make men pious. Unless the Holy Spirit accompanies the preaching of the gospel, it will be utterly ineffectual; and unless God bless the means employed to train up children in the way they should go, these means will not produce piety. But God does cause the faithful preaching of the gospel to be effectual to the salvation of souls. And in not the promise equally explicit that, if children are trained in the way they should go, they will not depart from it?" By humbly and prayerfully employing the means of God's own appointment, we have ample reason to expect that a fair proportion of the young may ultimately realize the glorious results contemplated. By systematically despising or neglecting the use of these means, we have no reason whatever to expect that any of these highest results will ever be realized at all.

5th. My object, as already stated, being, *not controversy*, but *truth, goodness, and utility*, it would wholly defeat my purpose were I to step aside and act the part of a mere controversialist. I have no controversy with any one; I have only a controversy with some of the *principles and conclusions of Lord Auckland's Educational Minute*. My main positions have hitherto been left *untouched*. As for the arguments and reasonings by which these have been maintained, it is far easier simply to assert that they are destitute of force, than *actually to lay hold on them and fairly to grapple with them*, in order to expose their assumed weakness. This has *not yet* been done. As to the want of evidence of which some complain, and the assuming of my opponent to be wrong instead of proving it, the fallacy of the charge is obvious. The fundamental evidence depends on the *erroneous and noxious* character of a large proportion of what is taught, *as truth*, under the name of Orientalism. This *fact* I certainly did assume, as a GRAND AND NOTORIOUS FACT. I assumed it simply because of its being *too notorious* to be gainsayed by any competent judge. In assuming it, I only reiterated the verdict delivered many years ago by the Court of Directors; by the accomplished Oriental Scholar, Rajah Rammohun Roy; and in substance by Lord Auckland himself. The *proof* of this fact, if such proof were *really needed*, would consist in *extracts and details* taken from the *Oriental works* published under sanction of the Public Instruction Committee. Such extracts and details, *if the obnoxious part of their system be not abandoned*, may one day be furnished as will overwhelm not a few even of the doating Orientalists themselves with surprise and shame. But, in the meanwhile, from a desire of peace and a sense of public decorum, we shall keep the condemnatory proofs and evidence in reserve;—waiting to see what course the better feelings and the more sober reflection of the Public Instructionists may lead them to pursue. My object is purely to do good and not to gain a victory. And if *the good* be secured without any more battling or exposure, my object has been attained. As to Lord Auckland, I have *not causelessly* assumed that he is in the wrong. I have indeed assumed two things as regards his Lordship's procedure; and I ask any man to shew me that I have assumed them without a reason. I have assumed an indisputable fact, and an indisputable principle. The *indisputable fact* is one substantially admitted by Lord Auckland himself, viz. that the Oriental system abounds with "radical errors and fatal untruths." The *indisputable principle*, which every being of unsophisticated conscience, whether "saint or savage or sage," cannot help admitting, is, that *wilfully to teach or cause to be taught, as truth, what is allowed to be a system abounding with radical errors and fatal untruths*, must be denounced as *wrong*. To assume, then, that he who does this, is wrong, is only to give expression to a sentiment, which requires no proof, which is antecedent to all reasoning, and which springs from the universal and resistless impulses of the moral nature of man. The Editor of the Englishman is too talented a man and too learned a scholar not to know, that one of the grandest errors of the scholastic Logic; which for ages deepened the mental darkness of Europe, was, to generate the persuasion that nothing was

proved and therefore nothing was certain, unless it was cast into the technical form of syllogistic reasoning—and consequently to generate the tendency of attempting to prove every thing—even axioms, or intuitive self-evident truths. One of the greatest triumphs of modern philosophy, on the other hand, has been, to assert and vindicate the assertion, that the grandest and most important of all truths are just those which need not and cannot be logically proved at all—those axioms or intuitive principles in physics and morals, the instant and universal admission of which springs resistlessly from the very constitution of our nature—and which we all believe, as Dr. Brown would express it, from the sheer impossibility of disbelieving them. That to speak what is known to be false or injurious, is wrong, must surely be held to be an intuitively clear principle in morals. And when I simply take for granted that to teach or cause to be taught what is false and injurious, must be held to be wrong;—do I not merely assume a principle in morals alike intuitively clear and indisputable? There are principles which it were arrant folly to attempt to prove. And this surely is one of them. These principles must precede all reasoning; and without them, no reasoning at all can exist. For any reasoning that is not based on some primary intuitive principle of belief is reasoning based upon nothing. It may exhibit all the form, and structure, and parade of demonstration, but being raised on a vacuum, it is worth nothing. Whereas a few sound principles, that strike home with all the force of intuition on every well constituted mind, practically applied, will display all the power and the force of the most rigid argumentation, and produce all the effects of demonstrable reasoning, without at all assuming the technical forms of the Logic of the schools.

Further, it were vain to follow the misconceptions and erroneous representations of those opposed to me. Lord Auckland's Minute and my statements are both before the public—though it is not in India that I ever expected any thing like justice generally, on a subject like the present. Still, let the wise and the good, judge and determine between us and our principles. Most of those who are actuated by the simple desire of doing good, unmingled with insidious motives of self-interest, unaffected by the maxims of worldly expediency, and unwarping by the projects of state policy, will fully coincide with all that is essential in what I have advanced. Of this description seems to be a writer in the *Courier*, under the signature of "A Reader." Though his name and occupation be wholly unknown to me, he has fairly studied and mastered the subject. He has caught a firm hold of the leading points; and in manly yet temperate language announces his sincere adhesion to them. This writer is the type and representative of a large class, which requires no further argument on my part;—a class, before whose clear judgment and benevolent hearts the rubbish of controversy will be scattered, like the clouds of dust, before the breath of the North wind. There is another class of persons who, from various causes, have a positive dislike to the side which I have advocated. These, of course, will not be persuaded if I could reason like an angel from heaven. If in my statements they can find no real faults or flaws, they are sure to make them or to fancy them. What purpose would it serve to enter into a controversy with beings of this hostile mould? None whatever. Each vindication would call forth some fresh repartee bested with stale fallacies. So that the thousandth reply would be wider from the real mark of conviction than the first. A truce, then, to all mere controversy, on a subject like the present, so far as I am concerned! Whatever be the verdict in India, I have no doubt as to the ultimate verdict in Great Britain. To hasten on the delivery of that verdict will henceforth be the great aim of the friends of sound, catholic, comprehensive education in India.

Last of all, it is but right to renew my acknowledgments to the Editor of the *Englishman* for his republication of the whole of my second letter, in his influential and widely circulated Journal. To the candid and the thoughtful it must be obvious that, in his own remarks, which are distinguished by his wonted

smartness and cleverness, his leading tactics have been for the most part to evade the main points of the Educational question, to divert the attention of his readers to minor concerns, and to drag, if possible, the author of the letters into some thing like a personal controversy. In the two former, viz. *evasion* and *diversion*, he has succeeded with the skill of a practised scholastic of the middle ages. In the latter, he might have succeeded too, had I that itch for mere controversy which is *professional* with some; or had I been doomed to such utter witlessness as not to discern the folly and the fruitlessness of allowing a grave discussion about momentous principles to be converted into a *pro and con pugilism* about petty paltry personalities. Though he has in some respects made me worse, and in others, perhaps better than I really am; and though, in his remarks, there are many glaring points of divergency from the spirit and purport of my statements, which it were easy to detect and lay bare, if any really useful purpose could be answered thereby;—it must suffice to say, that, however great the entertainment which vivacity, wit and humour may afford, they ought never, in a great national question like the present, to be allowed wholly to supplant or take the place of sound principle or solid argument. As for him, in whose native soil leaden-paced Dullness holds her monarchy—him, who walketh forth in the twilight,—when the underived effulgence of the king of day has given way to the pale borrowed beams of the queen of night, and the external world of ill-defined forms seemeth by sympathy or, mayhap, by peripatetic process of sensible species, to raise up an internal world of confused ideas,—it must be recorded, whether to his credit or otherwise, that he has, throughout, demeaned himself with great and remarkable consistency. Any statements, sentiments, or principles of mine, on which, in his nocturnal perambulations, he has happened to stumble, he either would not, or could not, distinguish in their proper forms and dimensions. Consequently, as perceived by his bedimmed vision, or represented by his palsied pencil, they are either diminished, exaggerated, or distorted; that is, in his sketches and outlines of them, they are *not mine at all*; they are *his own*, the genuine reflected images of *his own* misshapen ideas. Thus it is, that, from the first, instead of fairly grappling with what he unwittingly mistook for an antagonist, he has only been pugilizing with his own shadow. And most manfully did he encounter it. In the first onset, however, he fell prostrate in the dust. The shadow of course momentarily disappeared. What, then, more natural than to conclude that his imaginary foe was annihilated? But as he sprung up again, the fatal shadow started into being too—provoking to a fresh combat. And valiantly did he again and again renew the fight,—so that to his honour it may be rehearsed, as of the hero of Macedon, that “thrice he slew his slain.” But all this may seem too mystic and enigmatic. Well, let us try another illustration. From the first, then, it may be said that he threw himself, at one bound, into a thorny thicket of *wrong statements* or *still worse principles*—no matter, whether these were his own original sentiments, or merely perversions of mine. In striving to effect his escape,—he only succeeded in throwing himself back again, faster than ever, into the pricking thorns of error. And as often as the attempt has been renewed to right himself, this singular process of self-extraction has been renewed too—as if he were bent on out-rivalling, amid the occasional sprightly sallies of growing decrepitude and decay, the celebrated exploit which, doubtless, in nursery rhyme, he was wont, like other babes, devoutly to attribute to the Thessalian sage:—

There was a man of Thessaly,
And he was wondrous wise;
He jumped into a quickest hedge,
And scratched out both his eyes.

And when he saw his eyes were out,
With all his might and main,
He jumped into the quickest hedge,
And scratched them in again.

P. S.—Many of the friends of Native Education having urged the separate publication of these Letters, the author has been induced to comply with their request. And in order to prevent the possibility of being charged with partiality, he has also resolved to prefix, *not extracts* but the *whole* of Lord Auckland's Minute, in order that the reader may have at one view the text and the comment. Copies of the Minute and Letters may be had in a few days of “Ostell and Lepage” at the “British Library,” Tank Square.

APPENDIX.

The following is a list of the Oriental works which hitherto have been ordinarily employed more or less, as class books, in the Government Sanskrit and Muhammadan Colleges of Calcutta. Without any extracts at all, the bare reading of these lists will at once shew that all the grand and distinguishing peculiarities of the system of Orientalism with all its radical errors, deficiencies, and untruths, are systematically taught, at the Government expense, to the privileged classes of native youth—taught by Maulavis and Pandits who themselves intensely believe, and who inculcate on their pupils the necessity of believing, all that they teach, as indubitable, or even inspired verities! Here, are Hindu youth *laboriously initiated into the Vedantic Pantheism* which, by identifying matter with spirit and the creature with the creator, reflects infinite dishonour on the One Living and True God, confounds the distinctions of right and wrong, and virtually annihilates the moral responsibility of man! Here, too, are they taught the leading characteristics of the gross popular Idolatry; and the lying, thieving, treacherous god Krishna is held forth as a model for their imitation! Here the Musalmán youth, on the other hand, are systematically taught to refer to the Koran, as the sole, final, and infallible arbiter, in all questions of Law, Philosophy, and Theology—that very Koran which most expressly and formally consigns all Christians to the lowest Hell, for believing in the Divinity of the Son of God—the Redeemer of the world! And yet, there are those who still persist in declaring that it is the duty of a Christian Government to expend its precious resources on the teaching of all this to the higher and more influential classes of its native subjects! Can such persons be pronounced morally sane? If so, surely the only excuse which even the most boundless charity can devise in their behalf is, that “they know not what they do?”

A list of Oriental books chiefly used in the Government Sanskrit College of Calcutta.

GRAMMAR CLASS. व्याकरणादिशास्त्र.

- १ मुग्धबोधव्याकरण. 1. Mugdha-bodha, (The instructor of the ignorant) a Grammar.
- २ धातुपाठदीपिका. 2. Dhátú páth Dipiká, (The lamp of reading the roots.)
- ३ अमरकोशविधान. 3. Amara-kosha or Abhidhán, (a Dictionary by Amara Singh.)

SÁHITYA OR POETRY AND DRAMA. साहित्य अथवा काव्यशास्त्र.

- १ भट्टिकाव्य. 1. Bhatti kávyā, (The poem of Bhatti) on the actions of Ráma.
- २ रघुवंश. 2. Raghu Vangsha, (The race of Raghu.)
- ३ कुमारसम्भव. *3. *Kunár Sambhab, (The birth of Kártik.)
- ४ माघ. 4. Mágha, (The death of Shishupála.)
- ५ भारवि. 5. Bhárabi, (The adventures of the Hunter and Arjuna.)
- ६ नैषध. 6. Naishadha, (Poem on the marriage of Raja Nala.)
- ७ मृच्छकटीकनाटक. 7. Mrichchhakati, (The toy of cart) a comedy.
- ८ मालतीमाधव. 8. Málitimádhava, (a Drama.)
- ९ विक्रमोर्वशी. 9. Vikramorvási, (ditto.)
- १० उत्तररामचरित. 10. Uttararámacharitra, (The continuation of the History of Ráma.)
- ११ मुद्राराक्षस. 11. Mudrárákshas, (The signet of the Minister,) a Drama.
- १२ रत्नावली. 12. Ratnávali, (The golden necklace,) ditto.
- १३ शकुन्तला. 13. Shakuntalá, (The account of Raja Dushmanta and the daughter of an Ascetic.)
- १४ राजतरङ्गिणी. 14. Rájatarangini, (Chronicles of the Kings of Cashmere.)

RHETORIC. अलङ्कार शास्त्र.

- १ साहित्यदर्पण. 1. Sāhitya darpan, (The mirror of composition.)
- २ काव्यप्रकाश. 2. Kāvya prakāsh, (The lustre of Poetry.)
- ३ रसगङ्गाधर. *3. Rasagangādhara, (a treatise on Rhetorical composition.)

LOGIC. न्यायशास्त्र.

- १ भाषापरिच्छेद. 1. Bhāshā parichehheda and Sid'dhānta muktāvali, (The section of language and pearl necklace of demonstration) an elementary treatise on the terms of Logic with its commentary.
- २ न्यायसूत्रवृत्ति. 2. Nyāya Sutra Vritti, (Logical aphorisms of Gotama.)
- ३ सिद्धान्तलक्षण. *3. Sid'dhānta Lakshan, (The rules of demonstration.)

THEOLOGY. वेदान्तशास्त्र.

- १ वेदान्तसार. 1. Vedānta Sāra, (The essence or the scope of the Vedas.)
- २ पञ्चदशी. 2. Panchadashi, (Elements of Theism according to the Vedas.)
- ३ भगवद्गीता. 3. Bhagwat Gitā, (The dialogue between Krishna and Arjuna.)

MATHEMATICS. ज्योतिःशास्त्र.

- १ लीलावती. 1. Lilāvati, (Treatise of Algebra and Geometry.)
- २ बीजगणित. 2. Bijganita, (Algebra.)
- ३ खेचरतलदीपिका. 3. Khetratatwa Dipikā, (Translation of Hutton's Mathematics.)

LAW.

- १ मनुसंहिता. 1. Manu Sanghitā, (The Institutes of Manu.)
- २ मिताक्षरा. 2. Mitāksharā, (a compendium of Hindu Law.)
- ३ दायभाग. 3. Dāyabhāga, (The law of inheritance.)
- ४ दायतत्व. 4. Dāya Tatwa, (Principles of inheritance.)
- ५ दायसंग्रह. 5. Dāyā Krama Sangraha, (a compendium of the order of inheritance.)
- ६ व्यवहारतत्व. 6. Vyāvahāra Tatwa, (Substance of jurisprudence.)
- ७ दत्तकमीमांसा. 7. Dattak mimāṅsā, (Rite of adoption.)
- ८ दत्तकचन्द्रिका. 8. Dattak chandrikā, (Moonshine of adoption.)

*List of Oriental Books chiefly taught in the Government
Muhammadian College of Calcutta.*

GRAMMAR.

میزان	۱	1. Mízán.
منشعبه	۲	2. Munshába.
صرف میر	۳	3. Sarafmír.
تصريف	۴	4. Tasríf.
زبدہ	۵	5. Zubda.
اصل جملہ	۶	6. Asljumlah.
مایة عامل	۷	7. Máyata Ámil.
شرح مایة عامل	۸	8. Sharh i Máyata Ámil
منصباح	۹	9. Misbáh.
هدایة النحو	۱۰	10. Hidáyatunnaho.
کافیہ	۱۱	11. Káfiyah.
شرح ملا	۱۲	12. Sharh Mullá.

READING BOOKS.

نفاحة الیمن	۱	1. Nafahtul yaman.
عجب العجائب	۲	2. Ájb ul Ájáb.
تاریخ تیموری	۳	3. Tárikh i Taimúrí.
دیوان متنبی	۴	4. Dewán i Mutanabbí.
مقامات حریری	۵	5. Maqámát i Hirirí.

MATHEMATICS.

خلاصة الحساب	۱	1. Khulasá tul Hisáb.
اصول الجبر	۲	2. Usul ul jabr.
تحریر اوقلیدس	۳	3. Tahrír i Uqlidus.

LAW, (THE AUTHORITATIVE STANDARD OF
WHICH IS THE KORAN.)

نور الانوار	۱	1. Núr ul anwár.
هدایه	۲	2. Hidáya.
دایر الاصول	۳	3. Dair ul usul.
شرح وقایه	۴	4. Sharh Viqáya.
توضیح	۵	5. Touzih.
تلویح	۶	6. Talvíh.
مسلم النبوة	۷	7. Musullam ussabút

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

میبدی	۱	1. Maibudí.
صدر	۲	2. Sadrá.
شمس بازغه	۳	3. Shams i bazigha.

RHETORIC.

مختصر معانی	1. Mukbtasar Mání.
مطول	2. Mutawwal.

LOGIC.

قال اقول	۱	1. Qálá Aqúl.
میزان منق	۲	2. Mízán Mantiq.
شرح تهذیب	۳	3. Sharh Tahzib.
قطبی	۴	4. Qutbí.
رساله میرزا هد	۵	5. Risálai Mír Zábíd.
میرزا هد ملاجلال	۶	6. Mirzáhid Mulla Jalál.
شرح قاضی مبارک	۷	7. Sharh i Qází Mubáarak.
سلم العلوم	۸	8. Sallum ul ulúm.

EXPOSURE

FALLACIES INVOLVED IN THE DEFINITIONS AND AXIOMS WHICH CONSTITUTE THE BASIS OF THE CELEBRATED PANTHEISTIC SYSTEM OF SPINOZA.

INTRODUCTION.

BEFORE I point out the fallacies involved in the definitions and axioms of Spinoza, it will be advisable to state, in a few words, the main design of the author. Indeed, without such previous information, it is almost impossible—as will be shortly seen—to understand the nature of the fallacies; and, in some cases, the meaning of the definitions and axioms themselves. Some of them are so vague and indefinite, that it is hardly possible to make any thing of them; and I venture to say, that it is as impossible for one unacquainted with the designs and purposes of the author, to understand the meaning of some of his definitions and axioms, as it is for an unlettered mechanic to understand the learned languages. Others again, are so puerile and childish, that I wonder they did not occur to Spinoza. In his attempt to bewilder others by his net of sophistry, he seems to have been bewildered himself; and all his definitions and axioms are but the productions of a perverted judgment.

The main design of Spinoza was to establish the pantheistical doctrine, that there is but one universal substance pervading all space; and that all other things are but parts of it;—existing, it is true, in a different form, but essentially the same;—they are in fact but modes of the same universal substance. According to him, therefore, there is no Creator, and consequently no creature. We are not, according to him, the creatures of any superior being, but merely the parts of the same universal substance, which he called God. We are, therefore, all of us, parts of Spinoza's God. According to him, I am God, Thou art God, He is God; We are God, Ye are God, they are all God!! There is no creation, says Spinoza; but all is an entire mass of transformation. A part of the universal substance of which he speaks, is transformed into a horse, another into an elephant, another into a dog, and a fourth into a mouse; and so on without end. Every thing in the universe is a portion of Spinoza's God; and all the things in it make up his whole God;—in fact, this uni-

verse (which arose by the almighty fiat of the everlasting and the eternal Jehovah, and which will cease to be when He will be pleased to say "Exist no more,") is, strange to say, Spinoza's God!

One very obvious conclusion from this doctrine is unavoidable. If every thing in the universe be a *part* of the universal substance or God, we, as rational creatures, or more properly—for creature implies of necessity a creator, which Spinoza denies—we, as rational *beings*, are also some part of the same substance; in the same way as my right-hand is a portion of my whole body. And as all the members of my body constitute my whole body, so do all the substances in the universe constitute God! If then, we are portions of God, we cannot be responsible to him; for he is nothing but an aggregate of the substances existing in the universe! One part of God cannot surely be responsible to another part of God. We are not responsible for any thing we do, for it is not we that do it, but it is God in us that does it. If we are responsible for what we do, we as gods are responsible to God;—that is, God is responsible to himself. If then there be any evil in our action—and no one can dare say there is not—and if we were responsible for it, there is no fear of our ever being punished; for God will not surely punish himself! Thus Spinoza, freed from the fears of punishment, that limited and bound his actions, and confined him to a slavish, disagreeable mode of life, is at liberty to satisfy his desires, without the least fear of ever being required to give an account of the consequences which would flow from them. Now, I ask, what would be the state of the world if all men were to be actuated by the same motives? If the sons of the earth were once to be told, that after death, there is no such thing as a righteous Judge, who shall require an account of all that is done in this life;—that there is no such thing as punishment for what silly men call sin, what would this world be converted into? Instead of being, as it is, a world of mixed good and evil,—where there is neither pure good, nor pure evil, but a mixture of both,—it would be a hell.

I have no doubt but that if Spinoza had lived in Hindústan, he would have been a thorough Hindú. He would have heartily sympathized with the Hindús; and would have been a zealous advocate of Hindúism. Unhappily for Hindúism, her advocate was born in a foreign land, and was altogether unacquainted with a system that so much resembled his own. According to this system also, there is, strictly speaking, no creation; but like the system of Spinoza, all is an entire mass of transformation. Every thing in the universe is a portion of the substance of Brahma, just as the web of the spider is a portion of *its* substance. Can there be any doubt then, that a system which so much resembled that of Spinoza, would have found in him the warmest and the most zealous advocate?

But though Hindúism was thus deprived of one of her warmest and most zealous champions, who would have tried all his profound knowledge and learned erudition to uphold her tottering throne, and who did in one way try to do so;—yet, if it can be shown,—as we mean shortly to do—that all his attempts to establish his pantheistical doctrine have utterly failed; that the highest kind of proof with which he wished to support his doctrine, namely, mathematical demonstration, is utterly without a foundation; that all is an entire mass of assumption from beginning to end;—where is there a spark of hope left for Hindúism ever to raise her head? With the fall of her champion, Hindúism must also fall. When her last champion fell, Poland could not hope to raise her head;—when Kosciuszko fell, she also fell.

The mathematical demonstration of which Spinoza boasts so much, is, as I have said, without a foundation. Persons who are acquainted with this branch of human knowledge are aware, that the superstructures of it are raised upon certain elementary principles as their foundation. Every science has its elementary principles; and it is as hopeless to try to raise the superstructure of a science without these elementary principles as its base, as it would be to attempt to raise the superstructure of a great building without a foundation. The one is as impossible as the other;—there is no difference between the two cases. But though a foundation is absolutely necessary to enable an architect to raise his superstructure, it is not enough for him to have *that alone*. If he wish to give his building the strength and the firmness which would enable it to resist the destroying opposition of storms, tempests, rains, and other causes, he must have a *firm* foundation. All other things remaining the same, the strength and durability of two or more buildings depend mainly upon their foundations; and this *one* difference between them, will produce all the difference in the world. It is easy for us, therefore, when once we know the strength of the foundation, to calculate the strength and durability of the building. If the foundation be laid on sand, a common storm is sufficient to lay the whole building prostrate to the ground;—if it be laid on a rock, nothing is able to overturn it,—or at least, overturn it easily.

But what kind of foundation has Spinoza for his doctrine? Is it built upon sand or the immoveable rock? If it be built upon sand, it will not be able to withstand the opposition—as I have said—even of a strong wind;—but if it be built upon the rock of undisputed and universal principles, no opposition of any kind will ever be able to overthrow the least portion of it. But alas! unfortunately for Spinoza, he has no such strong foundation for his doctrine. It is not even built upon sand,—which would have been comparatively better,—but upon what is like a floating island, which Spinoza taking for firm ground, raised his superstructure upon it, not being aware of the fathomless abyss that is below it. It is needless to state the consequence of raising a superstructure upon such a foundation. The whole building must go down to the bottomless abyss, and disappear altogether.

It is not very difficult to show, that the principles which form the basis of Spinoza's doctrine, are all of them unsound. The definitions and axioms with which he opens his book are all of them fraught with fallacies and absurdities of the most ridiculous kind. In those rare cases in which a definition or an axiom is expressed in a more decent manner, and which is capable of something like an intelligible and good sense,—which I am sorry to say is rather an exception than a rule with almost all the definitions and axioms of Spinoza,—there is yet a stigma of fallacy and absurdity upon it when taken in a different sense, and in *the sense* in which Spinoza would wish us to understand; as if Spinoza were the mother of fallacies and absurdities, and could conceive nothing better. Almost every one of his definitions and axioms is an epitome of his whole doctrine; so that the propositions which succeed these are mere repetitions of those very things which have been already taken for granted in them. His whole doctrine is involved in his definitions and axioms, and these definitions and axioms, instead of being what they ought to be, principles that cannot be disputed, are themselves—as we shall very soon show—pure assumptions without any proof whatever. To overthrow the whole edifice of the pantheistical doctrine, which no doubt cost Spinoza

many sleepless nights, and laborious anxieties, a person has nothing more to do than show, that the principles on which it is built are all of them mere unfounded assumptions; and no sooner is that done, than the whole edifice falls to the ground. He does not need to go through the propositions before he is able to decide on the truth or falsehood of Spinoza's doctrine. A person who is able to overthrow the definitions and axioms laid down by Euclid in the beginning of his book, does not need to go through his propositions; for they are nothing more than what are actually involved in the definitions and axioms themselves. The truths contained in the propositions are involved in the definitions and axioms. In the propositions they are only clearly brought out, and shown to those who, from the weakness of their mental faculties, do not perceive them, until they are thus brought out, step by step, clearly and in a connected manner. If all men had the mind of Newton, who saw the truth of the propositions, as it were, intuitively, by only reading their enunciations,—these enunciations would have been sufficient. But as is universally known and acknowledged—there is a great diversity existing between the powers of different minds, so that almost no two individuals could be named who had the same mental powers. Almost every single individual has something peculiar and characteristic in his mental constitution, which entirely distinguishes him from any other individual. But whatever may be the diversity that exists between the mental powers of different individuals, they may all be brought to understand, sooner or later, the truths involved in the propositions of Euclid.

If then, we are able to show, that the definitions and axioms of Spinoza are, as I have said, mere unfounded assumptions, or mere absurdities and contradictions, what becomes of the stupendous doctrine of the celebrated pantheist? What becomes of the honour which he doubtless thought his favourite *absurd* doctrine—for it is no better—would procure for him? All his fond hopes are turned into disappointments. The golden age has passed away in which nothing was questioned, but every thing that proceeded from the mouths of learned men was considered as too sacred to be questioned. But in this sceptical age every thing is questioned,—even *that which proceeds from the sacred mouth of a Brahmin*. Spinoza, whose purpose was nothing different from that of a Brahmin, and whose doctrine so much resembled theirs that he might be considered as an Arch-Brahmin—his doctrine, instead of being received with veneration, and without a single word, is, by the sceptical sons of the present generation, questioned!

But Spinoza was not the only person who has to regret this growing scepticism. The Brahmins of India are also beginning to feel the consequence of imparting knowledge to those who, in their estimation, are little better than the brutes. The Europeans, who impart this knowledge, are, in this respect, their great enemies. The knowledge which they impart to the Hindú boys interferes with the rice and plantain of the Brahmin; and his sacred hands, which a few years ago were untainted by any work, must now be employed to fill his sacred belly! But, says the Brahmin to himself, all this is nothing different from what was expected in the *Kali Yug*. Nothing better can be expected from it. In this *yug* or age, the gods will be forsaken,—the Brahmins, who proceeded from the mouth of Brahma, disrespected by the Sudras, who proceeded only from his feet;—the sacred bond of caste, which has innumerable blessings and advantages connected with it, will be broken through by the sons of the

present age. These, and such like considerations, are the only consolations of a Brahmin, who is considered by the sons of the present generation as the very personification of deception itself.

DEFINITIONS.

DEFINITION I.—*By cause of itself, I understand that whose essence includes existence, or that whose nature cannot be conceived but as existing.*

I. If by this clause "By cause of itself," Mr. Spinoza meant the self-origi-
nal, and eternal cause, itself the cause of all other things; we find the definition
involves a grand fallacy, which lurks in the term existence.

The word existence is ambiguous; it admits of a double interpretation. 1st;
It is contingent. 2nd, It is necessary. By contingent existence of a thing, we
mean that which may or may not remain; for its existence is not necessary.
The existence of all created beings whether animate or inanimate, is contingent,
though actual; for if God, who governs the Universe, and who by his word brought
light into the world, pleased, He might not have created any thing at all, or if
He please He can immediately by an act of his volition annihilate all things.
By necessary existence we understand that, *which was*, and *which is*, and
which must be; and which cannot *but be*, and which *will be* hereafter through all
eternity. The existence of God alone is necessary.

Having now pointed out the two meanings that can be attached to the term
existence, we now ask Spinoza, which of these does the essence of the eter-
nal cause, or cause of itself, include? If he say the former, that is the
contingent existence, then we come to this conclusion, that God may exist or
not exist. If the latter, then the last part of his definition, "or that whose
nature cannot be conceived but as existing," involves a fallacy. For we cannot
form any conception* of the necessary existence of God. It is a metaphysical
inference drawn from some metaphysical considerations, addressed to our intel-
lect. Of that which is not cognizable by our senses, we cannot form any con-
ception whatever. To attempt to form a conception of the necessary existence
of God, is to attempt an impossibility. If both combined, that is contingent and
necessary, then we land to another absurdity of absurdities, which is dreadfully
revolting to every sober mind,—dreadfully revolting, because the absurdity
involves a glaring contradiction to the transcendental and immutable nature of
that all-wise Sovereign, and impartial Judge of the Universe, with whom all
things are possible but contradictions. Now by contingent existence, it is pos-
sible for him not to exist. But by his necessary existence, it is utterly impos-
sible for him not to be at any time, therefore the conclusion, which is indeed a
very wild and extravagant one, that it is possible for God to exist and not to
exist, to be and not to be at the same time, is inevitable.

II. If his meaning be otherwise, then the clause "By cause of itself" in-
volves a contradiction, which mocks all imaginations put together. The most
obvious meaning that we can attach to it is, something coming out of it-
self, or something that is the cause or maker of itself. But making is an action,
and an action implies an agent or actor, therefore something existed before
it existed, or something was before it was. To say further, the essence of
such a thing, which was before it was, includes existence either contingent or
necessary, or both combined, would be worse than sheer nonsense.

Now in whatever way we interpret the definition, it abounds with fallacies.
It is not a safe and universally accepted assertion, as Spinoza supposed.

DEFINITION II.—*That thing is called finite in its kind, which can be limited
by another of its kind, for example a body is said to be finite, because we can
conceive another greater, so thought is terminated by thought, but thought is
not terminated by body, nor body by thought.*

* Conception must here be understood in its ordinary sense as the term which de-
notes the trace or image of a sensible object in the mind, when the object itself is not
actually present.

I. The definition of the term *finite*, as is here given by Spinoza, is not a correct one; for it is *not necessarily* what he defines it to be. Now it is evident from the first part of this definition, that he made the limitation of an object by another of its kind, the only criterion or standard, whereby we can form any idea of finitude. But the susceptibility of a body being limited by another of its kind, is the most extraneous, and perhaps the most odd, if not, at least the most remote consideration, for the conception of finitude. What we generally, nay always understand by the term *finite*, is that which occupies a limited space, and perhaps a limited duration, without entertaining the slightest notion at the moment, of the capability or incapability of the body being limited by another of its kind; for instance, Why do we call a piece of stone a finite thing and God infinite? Is it because the one is susceptible of being limited by another of its kind and the other not? Surely not. It is because the former possesses a *limited* space, and *limited* duration, and the other an *unlimited* space, and duration,—*unlimited* space because he fills every space, and there is not room for another. Further consider and think for a time, for it requires a little effort of the mind, if the piece of stone of which I am speaking, were the only existing thing in the world, and suppose there were no other stones of the same kind for comparison, would we on that account call it an infinite thing? no: against this conclusion our reason revolts. Hence the definition of Spinoza is theoretically imperfect, and practically wrong.

II. If it hold true in point of fact, that in order to have an idea of finitude, it is necessary that the body should be limited by another of its kind, no less true would it be, were we to say that it should be limited by another of a different kind. For whether we limit the body by another of its own kind, or of a different kind, we form the same idea of finitude in either. Hence it is evident that in order to make the thing finite, it is *not* at all *necessary* that it should be limited by another of its kind.

III. The last part of the definition is equally fallacious. For we can say with equal authority and truth, that thought is terminated by the absence of thought; body is terminated by thought; and thought by body.

DEFINITION III.—*By substance I understand that which exists in itself, and is conceived by itself, that is whose idea does not stand in need of another idea to conceive it.*

This definition is not true and intelligible. The term substance is here ambiguously used. It has two meanings.

I. It is in its widest sense, as we understand, something which has real *entity*, or something *which is*. Now we can if we please substitute this general accepted meaning for substance; then the definition stands thus. By something which has real *entity*, or something which *really is*, “I understand that which exists in itself.” To put the question in a universal form, it should be, all things that have real *entities*, or all things which *really are*, have their existence in themselves; that is, they are the causes or makers of themselves without a creator. In a word to say all things are self-existing, for all have *real existence*; if so, nothing then is the creature of God; we are not related to him as creatures and creator, we are in equality with him, for we are both self-existing, and possess intelligence. This is quite absurd. For all nations however rude and barbarous; all religions however replete with falsities; all ages however covered with darkness and superstition; all reason however blinded by prejudice; declare with one unanimous voice, that there is a self-existing Being, who created all things in existence. Yea, all nature cries through all her works for the testimony of this. Every effect must have a cause, and a cause adequate to the effect. That there is a God who created all things, is an intuitive principle of our belief, which forces itself upon our conviction from a consciousness within. Besides if we admit that all things are created by themselves, then we land in another conclusion, which is very absurd, and worse than nonsense. For creation is an action, and an action presupposes the previous existence of an agent; but all things are the causes or the creators of themselves; therefore all things are before they are, or all things existed before they existed.

II. It is in its special sense, we understand the essence, or the ultimate substratum of a thing, apart from all its modes and qualities. Should we again substitute any one of these equivalent words, for substance, and proceed as before, then there remains no room for doubt, that we will in the same manner inevitably land into the very same foolish and absurd conclusions, contrary to our reason. Nay more than this, it involves a glaring contradiction to the second part of his definition, "and is conceived by itself." For how can a substance, or an essence of a thing, be conceived independent of, or apart from all its properties. The thing is ridiculous. Take for instance a book, deprive it of all its properties, both primary and secondary, if it be possible, then what remains? Of course the answer is, there remains something (which is known by the name of essence or substance) to which the properties that were formerly supposed to be taken away, belonged. Try now if we can, to conceive this thing. No, we cannot. We have no idea of it, neither is it at all possible for us to comprehend it, in the present constitution of the world.

III. "Whose idea," that is substance's idea does not stand in need of another idea to conceive it. Now what is an idea of a substance? If substance have ideas, which are the foundation of all knowledge, a stone then which is a substance must have ideas; it must then be possessed of intelligence, if so, it has therefore every chance of becoming a second Dr. Brown, the acutest and the best of the metaphysicians, or John Milton, the sublimest of the Poets; nay, for ought we know, the Sir Isaac Newton of the nineteenth century.

III. "Whose idea does not stand in need of another idea to conceive it." This language is totally wrong and grotesque. For can an orange conceive an orange? Or can a flower conceive a flower? Can anything inanimate conceive another which is inanimate or animate? No. How can then one idea conceive another idea? It is not the book that conceives the book, neither is it the idea that conceives the idea: but it is the mind that conceives all things.

DEFINITION IV.—By attribute I understand that which the mind perceives of a substance, as constituting its essence.

Now the fallacy of the first part of this definition would be at once manifest, if we explain the meanings of these two words, "attribute," and "perceives," or the ideas that they generally convey to our mind. By attribute in the proper and most common sense of the term, we understand any quality that is attributed to any intelligent being, especially to God, as the characteristic of him; such as goodness holiness, wisdom, mercy and justice. Of perception we know nothing except that it is the reference of an internal sensation to an external antecedent, that gave birth to it.

I. Having defined these two words, I ask Spinoza, what property is there in an attribute, which is the object of sensation, that we may refer this, to the attribute, as the cause of it. Now in order to obtain a perception of a thing, it is necessary that we should have a previous sensation of it—to have a sensation, it is essential that the thing must be possessed of certain properties. But in the case of an attribute we do not know any such thing.

II. It was already mentioned in the third definition, that the word substance is an ambiguous term, which admits of two significations. It means any thing that has real entity or existence; or the essence of a thing apart from all its modes and qualities. Now in whatever sense we take the word substance the definition does not escape a fallacy. By the former we come to this conclusion, any thing that has real entity must have attributes; such as goodness, wisdom. A clod of earth has a real entity, therefore it must be possessed of these attributes, which is absurd. By the latter we inevitably come to another absurdity which goes far beyond the boundary of human conception. For surely the mind cannot perceive an attribute of a substance or an essence, that is, it cannot perceive it, as belonging to it while it does not. For substance is without it. It has no such thing as attributes.

III. "As constituting its essence." Can that which does not belong to a thing constitute the essence of it? Can an attribute which does not belong to a substance constitute its essence?

IV. Attributes constituting substance's essence, that is attribute constituting essence's essence, is absurd.

DEFINITION V. *By mode I understand the affections or qualities of a substance, or that which inheres in another, by which also (or yet that by which) it is conceived.*

At a superficial glance over this definition of Spinoza, after being thoroughly acquainted with his third one, the grandest and the most palpable fallacy that strikes us,—strikes us intensely, because of the author who is guilty of it, is of such a nature, that indeed had any one, whose ideas and thoughts go in level of those of historians and politicians, fallen into a similar gross and monstrous error; he would have been thought of, either as a perfect maniac, utterly lost to all the right uses of reason, or a person overtaken for the moment by an apoplexy, that made him insensible and unconscious of all things, of which he had the knowledge before. Ingenious and subtile as he was reputed to be among the Europeans;—cunning as he was in his device of spreading his net over the great continent, yet he was foiled in his desires. He spread the net for others, but alas he was himself caught by it. Falsehood can never stand, though it be adorned with all the beauties of the world, and supported by the mightiest men of it, secretaries, judges, magistrates, kings and potentates. It must totter to the foundation at every opposition whether great or little, and at last crumble into pieces by a will from above. Truth must come out: it must stand forward, shine as the glorious sun, and triumph over every difficulty either late or soon. This we find is invariably the case and is in uniformity with nature's laws.

I. Spinoza in his third definition plainly asserted, that "substance is conceived by itself." Again in the fifth he declares that a "substance is conceived by a mode," by which said he ("I understand the affections or qualities,") which is a glaring contradiction to his former assertion. Now what can be more contradictory and incongruous than to defend one thing in one place, and say its exact opposite in the other. What can be more absurd than to say at one time two and two are four, and at another time not? It is then worse than sheer nonsense for him to say, that a substance is conceived by itself, and that it is not conceived by itself.

II. He made affections and qualities synonymous, which they are not. For by affections we understand the changes, which the mind undergoes. All the phenomena, or the states of the mind, such as sensation, perception, conception, thinking, will, reason, judgment, and comparison, are called its affections. These are the exclusive characteristics of the mind. By qualities we understand those properties by which a material object is known, such as solidity, extension, figure, &c. These are called the qualities—and qualities peculiar to a material object.

III. We have on two previous occasions mentioned, that the term substance from its equivocal nature, has two meanings. The one is the ultimate essence of a thing, apart from all its modes and qualities: and the other is the thing itself, including its ultimate essence, modes, and qualities. Now if we take the first signification, then the philosopher is guilty of *petitio principii*. He took for granted that *substance* has *modes*, that is qualities and affections, which it has not.—If the other, then he is still guilty of another fallacy, which consists in assuming that to be true universally, which is so only partly. True it is that the substance man has affections, but what affections are there in a stone, house, and such like other substances?

IV. "Or that which inheres in another." It should be which inheres in it, for how can we know a substance, while its mode (that is qualities or affections) inheres in another. Beside when he said mode inheres in another he furnished us with a ground sufficient to shew the absurdity of this phraseology. When a mode inheres in another substance, this presupposes that it has a separate entity, and that it, after leaving its own original substance, of which it was the mode before, comes out, and as it were dwells in the other, which is ridiculous. For by mode we understand the manner in which any thing exists for the moment. It has no distinct entity. It is nothing without a substance.

It is impossible for a mode of one substance to inhere in another. That which is inherent in a thing must always be so. Let us now here once pause and see, in what absurdity we land if we grant the definition to be true. It admits of no doubt, that the author tacitly granted, that here substance is a universal substance, that is God, if so, then mode inheres in him. The manner in which a pismire exists, is a mode, therefore it inheres in the universal substance—God. All things in the same way inhere in Him. All things then are parts of Him. He is not a separate entity distinct from these parts; but these constitute the Godhead. This is indeed the very theory which Spinoza labours to establish. But this is very absurd. For if we admit this, then we deny the very first truths of our constitution. 1st, The creation of the world by one Almighty, Omnipresent, and Allwise Creator, who is unchangeable in his being, “wonderful in counsel and excellent in working.” 2d, The future state of reward for the righteous, and punishment for the sinners. 3d, Every effect has a cause, and a cause adequate to the effect. Further let us remark in concluding, what would be the moral condition of the world, if his system were practically followed out by every one. It would be a world of devils, nay more than devils, and worse than hell; for the devils that dwell in it, know that there is a God of infinite power, and tremble on account of it. But the followers of Spinoza say, that the Universe is God, and that there is no other God but this.

DEFINITION VI.—*By God I understand the absolutely infinite, that is, a substance composed of infinite attributes, every one of which expresses an eternal and infinite essence.*

The definition with which Spinoza boldly sets out, is sound and correct. Every one must acknowledge, that no real objections can be started against it. For what can be more true than to say, that “By God I understand the absolutely infinite being?” It is almost universally granted. Hinduism with all its monstrous absurdities, and preposterous follies, dare not speak against it. But every candid enquirer must confess, and cannot but confess, that many fallacies imperceptibly lurk in the explanatory part of it, which he took much care to form, fashion, and clothe in such a manner, and so dexterous a way, that indeed it would have been impossible for a mind, that is little accustomed to meditate, to bring them out, had it not been previously acquainted with the author’s meaning of the word substance, and the use he should make of it, in the subsequent parts of his system. Let not then any one in perusing the sequel, be carried away with the idea, that I speak any thing respecting the definition itself, or, to prevent mistake, respecting the first clause. Far from such, I am rather an advocate for it.

I. We mentioned in the preceding definition, that by substance the author meant one great universal substance, God, the fountain and origin of all other things, animate or inanimate, material or immaterial; or in other words all things emanated, or flowed from him. If so, then we irresistibly come to this absurd conclusion. He is in all things, and is all things, because all are so many manifestations or rather parts of him, man, beasts, birds, fishes, insects, stones, &c. are therefore the fragments of God. Spinoza the great patron of Pantheism confounded here again the creatures with the creator. The distinction between them is here not only totally lost, but completely annihilated. Either all is creator and creature, or all is something which is neither. This is absurd.

II. “A substance composed of infinite attributes.” If universal substance be composed of infinite attributes, then all the parts of that substance must also be composed of attributes, though not of the same degree; for whatever is predicated of the whole, must also be predicated of the parts that compose it. Hence we are warranted to say, that beasts, birds, fishes, insects, and stones, which are the parts of the universal substance, are composed of attributes, that is of goodness, holiness, mercy, kindness, and justice, which is ridiculous. How foolish would it be to say a stone is wise; a bird is just; a beast is holy; a fish is kind; and an insect is benevolent.

III. Attributes cannot compose a substance.

Attributes without their manifestations by works to us are nothing. They are the indexes of them; they can only be known by them; in fact then the

actions constitute the substance. If so, then we can say, the functions of a magistrate constitute a magistrate. The functions of a teacher compose a teacher. The actions of a scholar make up a scholar: so in like manner the functions or actions of any thing compose or constitute any thing.

IV. "A substance composed of infinite attributes, every one of which expresses an eternal and infinite essence." It was also said by the same writer in the fourth definition, that attribute constitutes the essence of a substance. Now if we substitute the word, the *essence* of a substance, for attributes, then our proposition becomes this. A substance composed of infinite *essences* of a substance, every one of which expresses an eternal and infinite essence. Again by *substance* we understand an *essence* of a thing, therefore 'an *essence* composed of infinite *essences* of an *essence*, every one of which expresses an eternal and infinite *essence*,' becomes our proposition, which is ridiculous.

DEFINITION VII.—*That thing is called free which exists by the sole necessity of its nature, and is determined to act by itself alone. That thing is called necessary or rather forced, which is determined to exist and act in a certain determinate manner.*

I. If the first part of this definition be correct, then we irresistibly come to this conclusion, man is not a free agent for he does not exist by the sole necessity of his nature.

Man is a created being,—created by the Almighty sovereign of the universe, at first in a state of perfect righteousness, and true holiness—supplied with every thing that was necessary for his preservation, and nutrition, and above all, endowed with a rational intelligence,—consequently the power of choosing what is good from what is evil—that is endowed with a *free will* which distinguished him from the lower creation, and made him *responsible* to his Creator. Therefore the first part of the definition is utterly fallacious. For man is endowed with a *free will*, though he does not exist by the sole necessity of his nature. But if it be true as I first supposed, then the freedom of man must be denied which is contrary to right reason. For, let us pause and reflect here for a moment, and see, to what absurdity do we irresistibly land if we deny the freedom of man; and what would be the moral state of the world if man be a stranger to it? 1st. Man would not have been responsible to God his Creator, for the crimes which he perpetrates, for he has no free will; whatever he does, he does not by his own free will, but is prompted by another to do it. The prompter is responsible, but not the man, consequently deception, theft, adultery, bloodshed, murder, and all manner of wicked, wretched, loathsome, horrible, and abominable deeds, would have been practised without any limit and check. 2d, Man would have been brutalized altogether, and incapable to hold any intercourse or communication with his Maker. In a word the present constitution of things would have been totally changed for the worse.

II. "That thing is called necessary or rather forced, which is determined to exist and act in a certain determinate manner." It was already mentioned in the first definition, the existence of God alone is necessary. How can he then be determined to exist, and act in a certain determinate manner? He is from all eternity. He is not made by any. He is the self-original Creator, himself the cause of all other things. He is not bound to any law; but all are under Him.

III. Here the author made the words necessary and forced synonymous, which they are not. They are two different and distinct words. Although I may be forced by a tyrant to submit to his will,—forced by a villain to commit an atrocious crime,—forced by a reprobate to plunge a dagger into the breast of my tender relation, yet I am not bound by necessity to do them, on the contrary I am bound to do the opposite.

DEFINITION VIII.—*By eternity I mean existence itself, as flowing from the idea of the thing eternal; for such an existence is conceived as an eternal truth, like the essence of that thing: and therefore cannot be explained by duration or time, though we suppose it without beginning and without end.*

This definition is of such a dry, metaphysical nature, and it is written so very *difficultly*, that no philosopher however learned, no sophist however subtle, no

politician however skilful, can even after a long and deliberate contemplation understand it. The ideas of the author as manifested in this definition, have so far, I must acknowledge, gone beyond the lawful boundaries, that it would be vain for us to attempt to penetrate into them; I doubt not in the least that Spinoza himself, had as little a clear view of them, as a clown should have in a most barbarous country. If there be any definition more obscure and more meaningless, then that must be this. No legitimate meaning can be attached to it. If there be any meaning in it, then it is without sense.

"By eternity (said he) I mean existence itself." If so, then he must have meant the existence of something, either of God alone, or of all other things, including the Godhead, for what is existence without the things to exist.

I. If by eternity Spinoza mean the latter, that is the existence of all things, then we evidently come to this conclusion, that all things that exist must be eternal, and therefore co-eternal with God. He then cannot be their Creator; for he in order to be their Creator, must exist before them. As flowing from the *idea of the thing eternal*. This is to say, all things that exist flowed from the *idea of the thing eternal*: if so, I ask Spinoza, from whose *idea all things* flowed; from the idea of man or of God? For all are *eternal* according to this definition. 1st. If his answer be from the idea of man, all things that exist *flowed*, then we are reasonably warranted to say, man himself must have flowed from the idea of man, (for he is not out of *all things*.) that is the idea of man existed before he existed. But the idea of man cannot exist before his existence, therefore the idea existed before it existed. It has also been shown in this definition that man is co-eternal with God, therefore the idea of man is something which existed even before God. Again if all things flowed from the idea of man. Angels and Archangels, yea God himself, must have flowed from it. They then, as well as all other things, are the parts of man's idea. The idea of man is then a universal substance, out of which all things flowed, material or immaterial, animate or inanimate. All these are a jumble of incoherent nonsense. 2d. If his answer be from the idea of God, then it involves a striking contradiction to his definition, which maintains that all things are *co-eternal* with God. For in this case they cannot flow from his idea.

II. If by eternity he mean the former, that is the existence of God, in exclusion of all other things; then the fallacy of this definition becomes very clear and palpable, when we join the clause, the existence of God, to the other, "as flowing from the idea of the thing eternal." Because in this case as in the other, we again ask Spinoza, from whose *idea* the existence of God flowed? From the idea of man, angels and archangels, or of God himself. 1st, If he say from the idea of man; then we say, the existence of God is *not necessary*, but merely *accidental*. For had there been no idea of man God would not have existed. 2d. If from angels and archangels; then we land into the very same absurd conclusion as in the case of man. 3d. If from the idea of God himself, then his idea must have existed before he existed. But an idea cannot exist, every one must confess, before the existence of the being, of whom it is an idea, therefore the idea must have existed before he existed.

III. By eternity we do not mean the existence of any thing. For eternity is an incommunicable attribute of God, and by it we do not mean the existence of Him; far less the existence of all other things. As by beauty we do not understand the existence of a person of whom it is the quality; so by eternity we do not understand the existence of any thing of which it is the attribute.

IV. "For such an existence is conceived as eternal truth." The existence of whatever things we take into our consideration, God or any other things, is not an eternal truth. For we have according to this definition shown before, the existence of God is not necessary, but accidental; therefore his existence cannot be conceived as an eternal truth, neither can other things be called eternal truths, for they must either flow from the idea of a *man, who is mortal*, or of God, whose idea existed before it existed.

V. "Like the *essence* of that thing." Now what is an *essence* of an existence; if we do not know the essence of any thing, either material or immaterial; how far less should we know the *essence* of the *existence* of that thing.

AXIOMS.

All axioms or self-evident truths, to whatever science they belong, physical, moral, or intellectual, are of such a nature, that no sooner are they uttered than we immediately give our assent to them. They are the intuitive and instinctive principles of our belief, and are, as it were, an original part of our constitution, without which I must confess, we would have no foundation of reason or reasoning. But strange is the phenomenon in the science of our well known metaphysician,—strange because it is not to be met anywhere else. There has not yet been found one single axiom in it, which is free from objections, and has the capacity of forcing a conviction into our understanding, of its infallible certainty, without paying the least regard to its qualities, as all axioms which deserve this name ought. The axioms of Spinoza are diametrically opposite to all those of other sciences. They are spurious, if I am allowed to use such an expression, and are not therefore at all worthy of this name.

AXIOM I.—*All things that exist, exist in themselves or in another.*

Although this axiom of Spinoza is better than his former definitions, yet every one must confess, that it is not entirely free from fallacy, which creeps very secretly into it—better because there is a sense in which it can be considered as correct, though we peremptorily deny his definitions upon which it is founded, to be true and unobjectionable. Much ingenuity and sense I must say, have been shewn by the author in such a dexterous formation of the words of his axiom, as serves to answer his purpose in a remarkable manner. Without making therefore any reference to his universal substance, from which says he, all things flowed: let us state then, the one sense in which the axiom is correct, and the other in which it is not.

“All things that exist, exist in themselves.” We sometimes understand by this clause, that they have separate, distinct, existence; that is the existence of one is not confounded with the other. No one can deny: nor say any thing against the other clause, all things “exist in another.” For all things exist in God, that is, they derived their existence from Him. We as well as all other animated creatures live and move in Him. In this sense the definition is correct. But there is still another view of it, which is the following, in which the axiom is fallacious. True it is that all things exist in God, but they do not exist in Him as modes; or as eyes, nose, and lips exist in the face. So far we exist in Him, as an effect exists in a cause. We are no parts of him, as hands, feet, and eyes are of the body. God is the creator of all, and all are his creatures. Again with regard to the clause, all things that exist exist in themselves, we generally understand by it, all things are self-existent, which is absurd. These are the two different senses in which the subject may be viewed.

AXIOM II.—*That which cannot be conceived by itself, must be conceived by another.*

If this axiom of Spinoza be correct, then there remains no room for doubt or debate, that the thing substance, which means the ultimate substratum, or essence of any thing apart from all its modes and qualities, must be conceived by another: for every one knows it cannot be conceived by itself. Having thus drawn this inference from his axiom, that substance must be conceived by another, I ask Spinoza, what does he mean by another? Does he mean that it must be conceived by another of its own nature, substance, or of different nature, stone, gold, and silver, &c. Now if the latter be his answer; then it becomes foolish and absurd: for how can we have a conception of the thing substance, which is inconceivable, by a stone. If the former; then it becomes very ridiculous. For if it be foolish to attempt to form a conception of a thing which is inconceivable, by another which is tangible; how much more it is so, if we try to conceive an inconceivable thing, by another which is also inconceivable. Now in order to form a conception of any thing, it is essentially necessary, that we must have a full perception of it, or it must present a dis-
limage to our mind. But in the case of a substance, or an essence, we

have no such thing. If he deny either of the two previous suppositions, and assert that it is conceived by its properties, still his axiom is guilty of fallacy. True it is that we can have a conception of its properties, but thence is no conclusion that we must also have a conception of it. It is not the same thing with its properties, so that whether we conceive the *substance*, or its *properties*, it is the same. By the conception of the properties of any substance, we are only raised to the vague, undefinable, and indefinite notion of it, but not to the actual conception of it—never. We know it exists, but our finite comprehension cannot grasp it.

Spinoza in one of his former definitions mentioned, that a "*substance can be conceived by itself*," "that is, whose idea does not stand in need of another idea to conceive it." Again in this axiom he says, "that which cannot be conceived by itself must be conceived by another." Let us then ask our philosopher if we do not stand in need of another idea to conceive substance, or essence, which is the mysterious holder of certain properties, and which is invisible, and of which we can scarcely form even a vague notion, what thing is there in the face of the universe, which cannot be conceived by itself? There is nothing every voice will cry.

AXIOM III.—*A determined cause given, the effect follows necessarily, and on the contrary, if no determined cause being given, it is impossible the effect can follow.*

From this axiom of Mr. Spinoza it is evident, that the effect is necessary when a determined cause is given; for adds he, it is *impossible* the effect can follow when no determined cause is given. Before passing our judgment upon this axiom of our subtle metaphysician, it behoves every man first to investigate the meanings of the words, determined cause, and necessary; without which we are apt to be bewildered, nay for aught we know to be lost in endless confusion and intricacies, by the overwhelming objections, which are very certainly to arise, from the most cunning orthodoxes of his system. Let us now therefore see; what are the meanings of these two terms. 1st, By determined cause we understand a cause, fixed, limited, and which is determined to act in a certain determinate manner—that is, when a cause is given, it is *obliged* to produce an effect in a certain limited and prescribed way. 2d, The term necessary, from its equivocal nature, admits of double interpretations. It has a metaphysical, as well as a general meaning. We call a thing necessary, in the metaphysical sense of the term, as I have already alluded in one or two places, which *was*, and which *is*, and which *must be*, and which *can not but be*, and which *will be hereafter*. We also call a thing necessary, in the general acceptation of the term, which is absolutely requisite, either for the preservation of our lives, or the accomplishment of certain ends; either physical, moral, or intellectual; or which cannot but follow from a certain cause. Having established the meanings of these two words, we say the axiom of Spinoza is quite absurd, which can be shewn under three heads.

1. "When a determined cause given an effect follows necessarily"—that is, as I have already said the effect is *necessary*, which is quite ridiculous, if we understand it in the *metaphysical sense*. In order to illustrate this, let us take, for example, fire as a determined cause, calculated to produce a certain *necessary* effect. We see whenever we bring our hand in actual contact with fire, it immediately burns it—burns it always in similar circumstances. The burning of my hand then is *necessary*; but a thing is called *necessary*, which *was*, and which *is*, and which *will be hereafter*; therefore the burning of my hand *was*—*is*—and *will be hereafter*. But the burning of my hand is an effect, after a determined cause being given, or it did not exist before it being given; therefore the burning of my hand *was* before it *is*, it *is* before it *is*, it *will be* before it *will be*. It may be considered as correct, if we take it in the general sense of the term necessary; for it is true, that whenever we put our hand in fire, it burns it, if the circumstances be the same without any alteration, it must burn it; and cannot but burn it, as long as the constitution of the world is, as it is: in this sense only we may say the effect is necessary. However it would have been better if he had worded his axiom, as it has assumed this name,

in the following manner. A determined cause given, the effect follows actually, but not necessarily. For if God please, He can change the present constitution of the world, and give fire the property of cooling.

2. According to the axiom of Spinoza, we must admit man to be a determined cause; for several effects flow from him necessarily—necessarily in its general signification; if so, he can by no means according to the definition already given of the term *determined cause*, be called a free agent, which is absurd, as it was shown in the seventh Definition.

3. "*A determined cause given, the effect follows necessarily.*" This is tacitly taking the whole thing for granted. Our notion of cause arises only from seeing the effect; we would never have been raised to the notion of the self-originary cause—the fountain of all being, had we not been acquainted with the effects—the stupendous works of the creation, as flowing from it: so also it is true of all other secondary causes. How can then Spinoza give a *determined cause*, while it is not known by this name, until it manifests itself by certain effects. As we do not call a woman, mother, until she brings forth a son: so we do not call any thing cause though it exists in a state of potentiality, that is, in a capacity of manifesting itself as cause, until it exhibits itself by effects.

AXIOM IV.—*The knowledge of an effect depends upon the knowledge of its cause, and includes it.*

This axiom is false: it is contrary to facts: for what can be more erroneous than to say, that the knowledge of an effect depends upon the knowledge of its cause? What person is there, who tho' little accustomed to meditate, cannot immediately say when it is presented before him, that it is utterly fallacious. Multifarious examples can be brought forward, in order to show its complete absurdity. There are many effects, with which we are perfectly acquainted, still the causes that produced them, we are as ignorant of as a clod of earth is of its own existence. We know for instance that the food that goes into our stomach, after mastication and mixture with saliva, is after some processes, turned partly into blood, flesh, and bone, &c. Every one knows this undeniable effect too well. But is there any one in this globe, who can trace its cause? If we go round and round it, examine every country where we happen to land—may seek every position from the utmost extent of one pole even to the other, we shall not find a single individual, who however accustomed he may be to examine the human body, from the very moment of his birth even to the time of his going down to the grave, will be able to tell its cause.

The Hindus furnish several examples, which are familiar to every one, illustrative at once of the task now undertaken. They know the eclipse of the sun and moon; the regular succession of the rising and falling of the water of the Ganges, after a certain specified time; the earthquake, and the falling down of the rain from the sky. These they know as effects full well. But the question is, do they know their causes. Perhaps the most learned among them will say; Why, we know the causes as well. The giant *Raksh* devours the sun and moon, and that causes their eclipse. The shaking of the great serpent's head, upon which the earth stands, in order to put it on another head, for it has several heads, is the cause of earthquakes. As for the tides of the Ganges, and the falling down of the rain from the sky, they are easily accounted for. The Ganges is not an inanimate object, as it is supposed by the infidels, but she is a goddess; she can do whatsoever she likes: she can increase or decrease her water as it is her will, and this is one of the reasons why we call her a goddess. The rain comes from the trunk of the great elephant belonging to mighty *Indra*, the head of the gods. But here arises a great question. Do their assertions make these really the causes of the effects in consideration? These are so romantic that we cannot help here remarking, that they are the results of mere wild excoitations, and extravagant fancies. It is not difficult for any one to assign a false cause to a real effect. A great many similar examples can be here adduced, not confined to them only, but extended far and wide, to show the round and complete erroneousness of the axiom. But it would be here wearisome, uninteresting, and mere waste of

time to mention them; suffice it therefore to say, as every one must acknowledge, that the knowledge of an effect does not necessarily involve the knowledge of its cause.

"And includes it," that is effect includes the cause. When I say an empire includes countries, provinces, cities, villages, lakes, rivers, and mountains, &c. I mean these are within it as parts, which together make up the whole empire; so when Spinoza said, an effect includes its cause, we can in no other legitimate way understand it, than that cause is in the effect as a part of it, that is wherever an effect is, there is in it its cause, which is absurd. For in this case we not only confound the efficient cause with the material cause; but totally destroy the distinction that subsists between them. True it is that sometimes an effect includes a material cause; but it by no means includes the efficient cause. For instance the clod of earth out of which several pots are made, is the material cause, and is in the effect; but the potter who is the efficient cause, is not in it as a part. When Spinoza said, an effect includes the cause, he did not say, what cause he meant. The reason of this is obvious. For in this case his system would not stand. If we once admit that efficient cause is in its effect, we again land into the same absurdity, which has already been shewn, in some of his previous definitions, that we are the parts of God. It is more than impossible for us to comprehend, how an efficient cause can exist in its effect as a part.

AXIOM V.—Things that have nothing in common cannot be understood by each other, or the idea of one does not include the idea of the other.

All substances, whether they belong to the material or mental world, do possess something in common. We boldly defy our metaphysician, having the vast visible universe before him, to pick out one single example, illustrative of his axiom. Let him soar with seven fold wings of imagination above the visible creation, and pierce world after world of the invisible one, to furnish us if he can, with two things that have nothing in common. Vast field—both visible and invisible, is before him. Alas! Here the wings of his imagination tremble at the idea of soaring. Here his imagination utterly fails to produce two things which do not agree with each other in any of their properties. Here his genius, subtle as it is, humbly acknowledges its total incapacity to realize the axiom.

All things are connected with all things by certain common properties, or all things to speak more plainly, have certain things in common. Organised man, the noblest work of creation, has some properties in common with the in-organised clod of earth: the one has extension, figure, and solidity, so has the other. There is *nothing* which stands isolated, or which has not one thing at least in common with other things. The most dissimilar things, with which we are acquainted, are matter and spirit: but if we meditate upon them, we shall find, that even *they*, to speak the *least* of them, have one thing in common, viz. they both *exist*. Existence then is a property, common to both matter and spirit. In this respect we can say, that all material things, whether organized or inorganised, have something in common with that transcendent spirit, from whose goodness both celestial and terrestrial creation burst forth, replenished with intelligencies—endowed with all the capacities, sufficiently calculated to lead them to that excellence, which would end in their happiness. From all these previous considerations we are fully warranted to say, that the assertion of Spinoza, "things that have nothing in common, cannot be understood by each other," is quite absurd.

Before quitting the point under consideration, it is worthy of observation in passing, that here Spinoza is entangled in his own net, as he was once before. Here he contradicts himself, as he did in his fifth definition. The theory of Spinoza is, that all things are the modifications or parts of one universal substance: if so, then every man, who has a little spark of reason in him, must confess that they must all partake of the same essential properties with it. Whatever essential properties the universal substance has, the same properties must all things have, though in less degree; for they are all parts of it. To

say therefore, things that have *nothing in common*, is an evident contradiction to his theory.

If this axiom of Spinoza be true, then it evidently follows, things that have something in common, can be understood by each other, or the idea of one does include the idea of the other. But is this converse true? Before answering this question either in the affirmative, or negative, let us here once pause for a moment, and consider what can be the meaning of the phrase, things that have something in common, can be *understood* by each other. We can comprehend it in no other sense, than that in which a man understands a man; that is, they understand each other's language, customs, manners, &c. &c. if so, then we can say the converse of the axiom is utterly fallacious. For there are many things even in our earth, visible and tangible, which though they possess the same properties in common, yet they do not understand each other. A mass of stone for instance, does not understand a mass of gold, or vice versa. Where have we heard a glass understood a chair. The thing is ridiculous. Various examples can be adduced to shew the absurdity of the phraseology, but it would be mere waste of time to mention them.

"Or the idea of one does not include the idea of the other?" This involves a no less gross absurdity than the above considered phrase. Here the author confounded the things with the ideas of things. It was already observed in the fourth axiom, that a thing includes all other things, when they are within it. The idea of a giant brings into our mind the idea of a dwarf; the idea of a friend brings into our mind the idea of another friend, who resembles him in certain external or internal features; this brings into our mind the idea of some thing else; this again the ideas of some other things; and so on in regular series without end, by the principles of suggestion; but never does the idea of one include the idea of the other, or the ideas of others. If one idea include the ideas of all other things, then there must be one *universal idea*, so that when it comes into our mind, the ideas of all other things, or rather the things themselves, must start up before it, for they all make up or compose the universal idea. Which is ridiculous.

AXIOM VI.—*A true idea should agree with its object.*

Man, when he is sent into the world, is endowed with certain powers, or capacities to form various ideas. These powers are not infinite, but limited within a small circle, whose boundary they can never cross, by the volition of that Being, who sitting above the flood, hath controuled its impetuous course and said to it, "Hitherto shalt thou come but no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." However they develop themselves and come to maturity as far as they are allowed, not at once, but by degrees when corresponding objects are presented before him. As his powers are not infinite, but limited within a span; so his knowledge which depends on them, and which again gives birth to the conception or idea of any thing, cannot be infinite. As far then as his knowledge of any thing extends, so far his idea should agree with it, but no further. In this sense the axiom of Spinoza is correct. But there is still another sense utterly absurd, which the axiom admits. True it is that our idea should agree with its object, as far as our knowledge of it is obtained. But the properties which are known to us do not constitute the object; for there may be ten thousand properties latent in the object, which man can never know, as long as his means of knowing are finite. These together with the known properties make up the object. Hence it is evident that our idea cannot agree with its object in all its aspects, but only as far as our knowledge of the thing is acquired. If this axiom of Spinoza be considered as unobjectionable; then it evidently supports his theory, which he labours to support.

For in the latter sense we can have no true ideas of things. If so then we can have no true idea of God, who is far beyond our comprehension. Here Spinoza will hold an opportunity, and say, that if we have no true idea of God, then what kind of idea should we have of Him? A false idea, that is, the idea which we hold of Him is false, or in other words there is no such

being as God, or all are gods, for all things and all things alike, can give us no true idea, which is pantheism, the very doctrine which he tries to enforce.

There is much ambiguity in the term *agree*; when we say here are certain things which agree with each other, we then, if not identify them, at least we at all times, destroy their marks of distinction. Take for instance, two pieces of red cloth, and two glasses of water. When we say one piece of red cloth *agrees* with the other piece, we destroy their *distinction*. When we say one glass of water *agrees* with the other glass, we also destroy their *distinction*; but further we can identify them by mixing them together, because of their agreement. So when Spinoza said, an *idea* should *agree* with its *object*, he evidently destroys their distinction, and confounds the one with the other.

AXIOM VII.—*That which can be conceived as non-existent, its essence does not include existence.*

Being fully conversant with the system of Spinoza, we plainly see the two meanings, (conductive to the same result) which he could attach to this axiom, either of which is sufficient, both more so, to establish his theory.

We have previously shown in several of his definitions, that the chief object of Spinoza, was to establish the faith of one universal substance, and that there is no other god but the universe. If so, then we can easily guess out his arguments, which He would have used if required, for the support of his theory. The arguments are as the following. Can an animalculum *be conceived as non-existent*? Can all animalcula *be conceived as non-existent*? thus from the lowest creature, even to the noblest work of God, he would have asked a series of such like questions, the answers of which would be in the affirmative. Does the essence of such things then, he would have continued, which can be conceived as non-existent, include existence? The questioned would no doubt have answered in the negative.

The conclusion of this way of proceeding is obvious, that there is no God, for all are parts of God. According to him, if the parts which composed the God-head, can be conceived as non-existent, and their essence do not include existence, God can also be conceived as non-existent, and his essence consequently does not include existence.

As it is now proved to be true, "that which can be conceived as non-existent its essence does not include existence," so it is true, he would have said, that which can be conceived as existent its essence includes existence: for the proof of which he would again have proceeded in the same manner as in the first. The conclusion of such a procedure is also obvious, that there is no God. For if the essence of things which can be conceived as existent includes existence then nothing is created, but all are self-existent; for their essence includes existence. These are the two ways in which Spinoza would have proceeded to establish his pantheistic theory. True it is "that which can be conceived as non-existent, its essence does not include existence." But it is true only with regard to things whose existence is actual, but by no means necessary.

I perfectly agree with Spinoza, that all created things, whose existence is actual, can be conceived as non-existent, and their essence does not include existence. But it is impossible to conceive God, who *was*, who *is* and who *will be hereafter through all eternity*, for his existence is *necessary*, as non-existent. To attempt to conceive an impossibility is insanity. If it be possible for any one to conceive the non-existence of God, for my part I cannot; still his essence *must include* existence, for it is *necessary*.

All are self-existent. This conclusion is so absurd, that there is no need of many arguments to refute it: suffice it therefore to say that if all things be self-existent, then they must all be eternal and co-eternal with God; nothing is created, but all are creators of themselves, which is evidently confounding the Creator with the creatures.

CONCLUSION.

We cannot dismiss the present subject without gathering some practical lessons from it. For we must draw instruction from every source calculated to afford any,

The first grand lesson, that we learn from the character of Spinoza is, that the utmost care should be taken to cultivate the whole nature of man. The neglect of this most important duty, produces serious results. Man is born merely with certain susceptibilities, which require the presence of the objects calculated to draw them out, for their development. These accordingly become more or less developed in different men, in proportion to the opportunities afforded them. In the same individual also, some shoot out to a greater length than others, according as the one had been more studiously and diligently cultivated than the other. Hence arose the extraordinary phenomenon in the case of some of the greatest of men, that while they were philosophers in intellect, they were children in morality and religion. It is by no means an uncommon case, that men of the most elevated understanding and cultivated intellects, prove themselves to be babes, when subjects involving God and eternity come in their way. Speak of any thing to them but God, and they shew themselves to be the wisest; but speak of nothing but God, and they prove themselves to be perfect fools. Persons of this description may not amiss be represented, as spiritual monsters. Here then is a most important duty laid upon us, viz. to study diligently and assiduously the cultivation of our whole nature. That system of education is but too poor, which makes the cultivation of the understanding its sole object; for it overlooks the culture of the best and the most important part of man,—his moral and religious nature. Mere worldly learning, received in a mind that is naturally sinful, does nothing but mischief to man.

" Learning itself received into a mind
By nature weak or viciously inclined,
Serves but to lead philosophers astray,
Where children would with ease discern the way."

It is therefore a matter of highest concernment, to train up young men in the way of truth and moral rectitude; to convey to their minds true notions of the nature and attributes of God; and to actuate them to act in conformity with their notion of the deity. If this be neglected at the proper time, then either their capabilities of receiving moral instruction will be deadened; or they will begin to form unworthy notions of the nature and character of God, which will impart an indelible coloring to their future life and conduct. But how often do men forget this simple but highly momentous truth. There are not a few, that pay exclusive regard to the melioration of their intellect, while they leave uncultivated the best part of their being, the moral nature. There are many that overvalue their intellect, as the only luminary from which they can expect the greatest quantity of light, without minding at all, that the light furnished by the intellect alone is but too feeble, and cannot shine beyond the limits of the present world. It is only the light of divine religion, that can guide a man in the interminable path of eternal existence, and cheer him in the bed of death with the prospects of immortality. Let every one then with his whole heart, mind and strength, apply himself in humble prayers to God, for assisting him in his procedure, to the improvement of his moral nature, that would raise him, more and more, unto the likeness of his most holy Creator, and prepare the way for his entering into the kingdom of God.

The next great instruction that we derive from the history of Spinoza is, that mere ingenuity and natural brightness of intellect, are not sufficient to lead man in the present state of his sinfulness and corruption, into the way of truth. These are indeed highly useful and necessary to man

when properly regulated and applied ; the danger springs entirely from their excess or defect, but especially from wrong direction. Various are the means, whereby our understanding is led in a wrong direction, and numerous are therefore the impediments that hinder in our search after truth. The natural perverseness, and precipitancy of the human mind ;—the numerous preconceived opinions, misconceptions and prejudices ; too much expectation from our intellectual powers ; over-confidence in the report of the senses ; and the passions, affections and peculiar dispositions, which spring up and grow with our growth, present in many instances insuperable barriers in the way of attaining truth. Now as these do chiefly blind the mind, and pervert the judgment, it would not be deemed unprofitable to take some brief notice of them, with a view to imprint deeply the necessity of their eradication from our minds.

1.—Perverseness. Man in his sinful state makes an obstinate opposition to those truths, the adoption of which would oblige him to abandon his beloved vices. The atheist perversely sticks to the belief that there is no God, before proofs the very least of which would no doubt convince him the opposite if he but will; but he wills not, because he is afraid to own a God.

2.—Precipitancy. Of all the errors into which mankind fall, many of them can be traced to the precipitancy or hastiness with which their opinions are formed. Nothing seems to be more wearisome to the human mind, than a state of doubt and hesitation. It therefore bounds from truth to truth, with a rapidity that might have been sustained without danger, had it not fallen from its original state and lost much of its primitive capability. Hence men jump to conclusions, and thereby adopt one-sided unphilosophical hastily formed, and unwise views.

3.—The pre-conceived opinions, misconceptions and prejudices, exert a great influence in blinding one's mind, to the reception of truth. When the mind is once pleased with certain things, it draws all others to consent to, and go along with them. In the same way when it once entertains a hatred against certain other things, however groundless that may be, it stands proof to all other things that would lead it to form a different opinion. And though the power and number of instances that support the contrary opinion, are much greater than those which favor his adopted suppositions, yet his mind either does not attend to them or despises them, or passes by them, or removes, rejects or explains them away, with a strong and pernicious prejudice to maintain inviolate the authority of its first choice.

4.—Nothing is a more fruitful source of error among men of genius, than that of expecting too much from the application of their intellectual powers. They often lose sight of the great truth, that man is a finite being, and therefore his mind is limited in its capabilities. The mind of man can rise but a certain height and there its powers must fail. We are surrounded with mysteries on every side. We cannot move in any line of thought, for any length of time, without soon finding ourselves encompassed with insurmountable difficulties. But the minds of some men cannot rest. They are continually shooting themselves out, and pressing on, though to no purpose. Not knowing how or where to stop, they bewilder themselves in seeking greater satisfaction respecting truths which lie far beyond the reach of their limited faculties.

5.—Undue confidence in the report of the senses, and drawing unwarranted conclusions from them, is another spring of mistake and error. We being entirely engrossed by the objects of senses, in the first part of our life, and familiar with them in all our days, are apt to overlook the incompetency of the evidence of sense, in all subjects. To this head must be

referred the error of considering a human figure and human passions as belonging to the Supreme Being?

6.—The influence of passions and affections also is very powerful and dangerous. They can give a turn to the understanding in any way they please. What men desire to be true, they are most inclined to believe. The understanding rejects things just, solid, and real, because they curb the ambition, condemn evil propensities or limit the hope. Thus in numberless ways, and very often in an imperceptible manner, the affections of men tinge and infect the understanding.

But if we are to seek for the source, from which all these weaknesses of man took their origin, we must go up to the fall of man and to the corruption of his moral nature by the introduction of sin. By the fall, the health of his moral feelings was directly injured, and his understanding has indirectly partaken of his moral deterioration. For,

“Faults in the life breed errors in the brain,
And these reciprocally those again,
The mind and conduct mutually imprint
And stamp their image in each other's mint.”

Sin having taken its seat in the mind of man, has spread its pernicious influence over his whole system. Man is no longer a perfect being. He has become depraved of heart, defaced of understanding and hardened of conscience. Sin has spread a thick cloud of darkness over his mind, and stopped thereby all passage to light. He roves in total darkness without a single ray of light to direct him in the path of truth, while sin feigning itself true light misleads him (like the ignis fatuus in the marshes that deceives a benighted traveller,) into the bog or pit of everlasting misery. It therefore requires a divine sun to expel the darkness that is gathered over the mind of man, and to show him the way of life and truth. Sin again has afflicted his soul, with all manner of diseases. It has dimmed the eyes of his mind, so it can no more clearly see. It is a deadly sore to his soul, which ends with nothing but with its death. And as a sickly stomach has a disrelish for every thing promoting health, so a sinful soul loathes what is truly desirable. Man therefore stands in utter need of a divine Physician to heal his soul, from the disease under which he labours. He requires a help directly from heaven to renew him in the whole man, after the image in which he was created. Let him then with prayerful spirit and penitent heart turn his eyes towards heaven, and ask, with a feeling of his own nothingness and helplessness, the aid of the Almighty and ever merciful God, who taketh no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but offereth him everlasting life, if he but cast himself on his care.

“Hear the just law—the judgment of the skies,
He that hates truth must be a dupe of lies,
And he that will be cheated to the last,
Delusions strong as Hell shall bind him fast.
But if the wanderer his mistake discern,
Judge his own ways and sigh for a return,
Bewildered once, must he bewail his loss,
For ever and ever? No—the Cross;
There and there only (though the Deist rave;
And Atheist, if earth bear so base a slave;)
There and there only is the power to save
There no delusive hope invites despair;
No mockery meets you, no deception there.
The spells and charms, that blinded you before,
All vanish there, and fascinate no more.”

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CHARGED WITH

SPIRITUAL TREASON :

OR,

IDOLATRY AND MUHAMMADANISM PATRONIZED IN THE
RESUMPTION LAWS.

EXTRACTED FROM THE CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

" Be wise now, therefore, O ye Kings — Be instructed ye Judges of the
Earth "—(Psalm ii.)

CALCUTTA :

PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, CIRCULAR ROAD.

1844.

THE COMMANDMENT OF GOD. "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me :—Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the waters under the earth : thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them :"—Exod. xx.

THE CHRISTIAN COMMENTARY. "Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry. The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God : and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Do we provoke the Lord ? Are we stronger than He ?—Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers ; for, what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness ? and what communion hath light with darkness ? and what concord hath Christ with Belial ? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel ? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols ? For ye are the temple of the living God—wherefore come out from among them and touch not the unclean thing !"—(1 Cor. x. ; 2 Cor. vi.)

THE ANTI-CHRISTIAN REGULATION. "Whereas considerable endowments have been granted in land, by the preceding Governments of this country, and by individuals, for the support of Mosques, HINDU TEMPLES and Colleges, and for other *pious and beneficial* purposes : and whereas there are grounds to suppose that the produce of such lands is in many instances appropriated contrary to the intentions of the donors, &c. and whereas, it is an important duty of every Government to provide that *all such endowments be applied according to the real intent and will of the grantor, &c. &c.* : The general superintendence of all lands granted for the support of Mosques, Hindu temples, Colleges, and for other pious and beneficial purposes, &c. is hereby vested in the Board of Revenue, and Board of Commissioners, &c. It shall be the *duty of the Board of Revenue and Board of the Commissioners* to take care that all endowments made for the maintenance of establishments of the above description be *duly* appropriated to the purpose for which they were destined by the government or individual by whom such endowments were granted."—[Regulation XIX. of 1810, of Indian Government.]

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CHARGED WITH SPIRITUAL TREASON :

OR, IDOLATRY AND MUHAMMADANISM PATRONIZED IN THE
RESUMPTION LAWS.

I.—INTRODUCTION.

TREASON is a charge of heavy and fearful import ; and yet, no less a charge must we now bring against the Government of India, than that of *Spiritual Treason*. Idolatry is a vile and abominable attempt at substitution for the one only GOD, the Sovereign of the universe—Muhammadanism is a base and wicked attempt at substitution for the one only Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, whom God has sent : to patronize these knowingly and wilfully, is conduct for which we can find no more accurate term of description, than that which we have just employed, treason, spiritual treason :—and of such treason we impeach the Government of India, inasmuch as they do knowingly and wilfully, not merely connive at, but patronize the Hindu Pantheon, and the Muhammadan Anti-christ.

We are not now called upon to consider the question, how far the worshippers of false gods, or followers of the false prophet, are responsible to God, or guilty in his sight. Yet even on this question we have a direct and decided opinion, drawn from the unerring word of the Sovereign of the whole earth ; an opinion which may be safely expressed, as well as safely believed in His own very words,—and which we leave to be viewed in their own native strength :—Thus,

1. As to their RELIGION, it is written :—“ The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness, and unrighteousness of men, who hold

the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in (or to) them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: because that when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened:—Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and changed the glory of the incorruptible God unto an image like unto corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed beasts and creeping things—who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more (rather) than the Creator, who is blessed forever: Amen.”

2. As to their *moral*ity it is written:—“ Even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind (or, void of judgment), to do those things which are not convenient—being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity—whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful:—who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same but have pleasure in them that do them!” (Rom. i.)

We believe that all who are capable of giving account one to another, are accountable also to God; yea, still more responsible to Him than they possibly can be to man:—and on the same grounds we believe, that they are accountable for their religious conduct, to the utmost extent of their natural faculties, and external opportunities, in the sight and judgment of God. Beyond this also, whatever other inferences may be fairly derivable from these premises, we are prepared to hold and defend:—supported as we are, may secured, both in our premises and conclusions, by the word of God which declares of the heathen, that they are “ without excuse,” before the Judge of all. But, suppose that they are so fearfully degraded by Heathenism as to cease to be accountable for their religious conduct towards God, (which is just to say, that the effects of evil may ultimately remove the very guilt of evil, a monstrous contradiction!) what name shall we give to the conduct of those who do willingly confirm, endow, and reward them in their

ruinous and God-dishonouring systems? Or, suppose on the other hand, that they are admitted to be accountable for their belief in the abominations of Hinduism, or in the foul impostures of Muhammad—then what name shall we bestow upon the conduct of those who do deliberately patronize an empire of many millions of men in the substitution of Krishna or Káli for God, or in the supplantation of the blessed Jesus by the vile impostor Muhammad? He that harbours a thief, must accompany him to prison:—he that holds the victim of murder, is judicially stained by his blood:—he that feeds and pays the traitor, is partner of his crime, and sharer of the axe and block:—such is even human justice—a spark of that which is divine; of that divine justice which saith, “Be not partaker of other men’s sins” —and “The companion of fools shall perish!”

It avails nothing as a defence, at this point, to appeal to *motives*, and say—“This patronage of false religion is exercised, not from bad, but from good motives—it is done for *good*.” For good, to whom? To the people, or to the Government?—To the latter. And what is the good sought for?—Popularity—And why popularity?—~~For~~ the sake of power. And why power?—To obtain revenue. And what is the ultimate end of revenue?—Gain. Who is silly enough, is hypocritical enough, to deny, that India was ruled and is ruled, ultimately, for gain? The good to be attained is one of self:—it is purely selfish; and to this is sacrificed the acknowledgment of the supremacy of God, of the revelation of salvation by the Lord Jesus Christ. We say sacrificed, not by neutrality, but by hostility—direct hostility; Muhammadanism is patronised to secure the Muhammadan, and Hinduism to secure the Hindu; but both Muhammadans and Hindus, are the enemies alike of the Christian’s God and Saviour; and what is the patronage of the one, is treason against the other. To patronize evil for the sake of gain, may not be quite so bad as to patronize it for pleasure, in the judgment of many; but even such a theory can only modify, it cannot remove, the charge of guilt:—for after all, what is the love of gain, but the pleasure of possession in its germ? Yet alas!

even this little measure of modification may be more than counterbalanced, by the fact that the Patron of sin is far superior in moral, religious and intellectual advantages, to those who are but patronized in their sin : “ To whom much is given, of the same much shall be required ;”—and surely he who with the Bible in his hand, patronizes the idolatry of the Hindu, and the anti-christianism of Muhammad, for the sake of power or of gain, is a guiltier man than that degraded victim of delusion who surrenders his powers or expends his gains, however sinfully, in the temple of images, or in the mosque of the Arabian impostor !

Some there are who would have this painful subject of political sin, to be more tenderly dealt with ;—instead of treating of such conduct as SPIRITUAL TREASON against God, they treat it only as religious inconsistency, as injurious to the people, as oppressive to the consciences of Government servants, or even, it may be, as politically most inexpedient in the end ; and thus would they leave it with the judgment and feelings of the parties concerned. Now, we cannot thus speak softly, because we cannot thus make ourselves feel tenderly—we do not even wish to do so :—we cannot speak of murder as “ a serious fault” —we cannot speak of theft as an “ injurious weakness,” or of forgery, as an “ unfortunate habit ;” —we say they are crimes, wicked and detestable crimes, in the secular catalogue of evil :—so also in the spiritual department, we must call the patronage of a false god against the true God, and of a false prophet set up against God’s anointed Son Christ Jesus, SPIRITUAL TREASON ; and challenge to the proof them who deny it. Besides, when we say to such men, “ You are religiously inconsistent” —they say, “ Of that *we* are best judges—it is our own concern :” —or, “ You do what is injurious to the people” —they reply, “ Of that the people can judge for themselves—they prefer what you term injury, to what you consider as benefit :” —or, if we further say, “ By such patronage you oppress the consciences of many of your servants” —their answer is, “ Then, let them depart and go where they

may be free." No doubt, to all these specious replies, most effectual answers might again be given, and even a victory gained by proposing the LAW OF GOD for consideration: but then this would only bring on the very issue for which we have been contending, a spiritual trial at the Bar of God's present revealed judgment in the Bible, on the duty of man to His Creator and his fellow-creatures; and *there*, we know, that God's curse is pronounced on idolatry and false religion:—and by consequence on all that cherishes and promotes them. They who share the sin, must also share the ban. Hear this law—what saith it? GOD SPAKÊ, SAYING,

I. THOU SHALT HAVE NO OTHER GODS BEFORE ME:

II. THOU SHALT NOT MAKE UNTO THEE ANY GRAVEN IMAGE, OR ANY LIKENESS OF ANY THING THAT IS IN HEAVEN ABOVE, OR THAT IS IN THE EARTH BENEATH, OR THAT IS IN THE WATER UNDER THE EARTH; THOU SHALT NOT BOW DOWN TO THEM NOR SERVE THEM: *For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me—and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.*

Than such commandments nothing can be more explicit; nor can any thing in morals or in reason be more evident than this, that if the violation of these be sin, so also is the abetting of that violation, a sin of the same order; and that, should the principal in the transgression not know that his act is treason, if the abettor do know it to be such—then the abettor's sin is so much the greater, because he serves himself by another's ignorance, and advances himself by his neighbour's weakness.

We are here met with the prejudiced and uncandid remark, "This is an old and worn-out subject:—we are wearied of it: there is nothing new to say regarding it—are there any fresh charges to bring?" If the subject be indeed thus old and trite, so much the worse for those who have given occasion for such perpetuity of discussion, and so much the better for those who have never ceased to expose and contend against so sad an evil

as the Christian patronage of heathen idolatry and Muham-
 madan anti-christianism :—and we are happy to think that the
 so-characterised discussion has not been in vain ;—nay more,
 we feel encouraged by the past success of a few in this impor-
 tant service, to add another little attempt to this stock of Chris-
 tian operation. And perhaps too we may be able to bring up
 a little comparatively “*fresh*” matter, in this renewed discus-
 sion—matter at least which has not as yet been brought
 prominently forward. For we are not about to adduce charges
 from bygone things or disputed allegations :—we are not now
 returning to pilgrim-taxes, honorary salutes, anniversary
 ceremonies, idolatrous oaths, the revenues of Juggernáth—
 some of them still existent and others defunct :—but we now
 call the attention of our readers to an existent, active, arbi-
 trary, well-defined, closely-regulated, widely-practised and
 gratuitous system of idolatrous and anti-christian patronage,
 embodied in THE RESUMPTION LAWS AND REGULATIONS OF
 THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

The subject of RESUMPTION in its financial, judicial or politi-
 cal relationships, belongs not to us here ; nor shall we in these
 pages intermeddle with these its civil or secular merits. It
 involves of necessity in it many elements both of interest and
 of prejudice, as well as of claim and judgment, which nowise
 belong to us as Christians, however they may affect us as sub-
 jects of authority, or challenge our investigations as thinking
 men ;—these therefore we leave untouched. But if RESUMP-
 TION has stepped out of its secular place, and ventured on
 religious ground ;—if leaving the cabinet or the treasury, she
 has occupied the idol temple, and endowed the infidel mosque
 —if she has meddled with the decalogue of our God, and
 supported the enemies of our blessed SAVIOUR—then does she
 become the lawful captive of him who can seize her, the justly
 condemned victim of the Bible’s divine tribunal. On such
 grounds, do we deal with this subject :—we have done our best
 to procure accurate information regarding it ;—our facts and
 documents we have received from the best authorities we could

reach:—our judgments and opinions are our own, for which of course we are responsible, and in which, if need be, we are prepared to stand to our defence. For the result, we have no fear, and can harbour no doubt—because we know that our cause is right.

II.—THE CHARGE.

RESUMPTION, in its present connexion, denotes the *resuming*, on certain judicial grounds, or through certain judicial procedure, of lands which had for a length of time been free from revenue-assessment; that so they may again become subject to their share of that necessary public burden. The immediate object of the process is to enquire into the validity of the title on which such exemption has rested;—and the ultimate object is, to restore to their full share of financial obligation, all lands for which a sufficient title of exemption cannot be maintained. The political revenues of India, under its successive and varied sovereigns, from time immemorial, have been derived from a direct tax upon land, or (what some would term) a modified rent for the land itself, as supposed to belong to the sovereign-possessors for the time. Into the origin of this peculiarity of political finance, we need not here enter;—the fact is sufficient at present for the illustration of our part of the subject. *Exemption* from such a burden, as it was the sovereign's prerogative to confer, so was it a landholding subject's desire to obtain:—and we find that such exemption was, very freely, extensively and arbitrarily bestowed, whether as a reward of services rendered, a bribe for attachment sought, a mere mark of selected favouritism, or, as in many cases, a pledge of intense and crouching superstition. Large tracts of land, and corresponding portions of revenue, were thus alienated from the service of the state; new claims and titles of tenure were thus multiplied—subdivisions of property into parts and driblets followed—and in the course of time the country became chequered with an endless multiplicity of privileged proprietors and of rent-free lands.

The necessary effect of such a system, in the course of time, has been, to present to an unprincipled people the strong temptation of forming false claims, or pretending to tenures of lands thus freed from revenue rent; trusting to the lapse of time, political confusion, and to the unfailing abundance of false witnesses ever to be obtained for the meanest bribes in this land of deceit, for ultimate success to themselves or their descendants. Through a process of this sort, long carried on, an immense amount of false claims was established—so that iniquitous possession became a law of prescription. The necessities of the state, together with a love of revenue, perhaps not unaccompanied, in some political agents, by a sense of justice, led to enquiry; the enquiry proved that judicial investigation was needed;—judicial investigation shewed that a very large resumption of lands, however hard or severe a measure, would yet be legally just and financially useful:—the resumption process was begun. It was put under the guidance of *Regulations*; and these regulations, drawn up from time to time during many years, some for special cases, others on general grounds, form an official, authoritative and very clear revelation of the mind of the Indian Government on the subject now before us, the financial encouragement of idolatry and false religion. To these “*Regulations*” our appeal shall be ultimately and fully made.

The cession of the Indian states successively to British rule (we pass no opinion on the merits of such cession), presented a favourable juncture for enquiring into all those subordinate tenures of property, the sources of land revenue, of which the aggregate of the territories consisted;—and as the Government usually undertook or was supposed to undertake all those internal burdens, of a legal or equitable kind, which it found already existing, it claimed a right of enquiry into the tenures of all those properties which demanded exemption from the general obligations of contributing to the income of the state. The juncture was embraced—and the process brought to light what was expected, that many lands which had been treated as

rent-free, were in point of law still rent-bound; they were subjected to proof, and found wanting in the evidence of their privileged claims. Some claimants might present false charters—others rest on traditional prescription, backed by false evidence—some might trace their possessions to the donation of inferior officers of a former dynasty, who had not the right to alienate or bestow—and others might be able to shew nothing but simple and unquestioned possession of the soil:—but whatever the plea, if insufficient, the property was *resumed* into its original financial obligations; whilst in most cases the occupants were pensioned off, as some reparation for a severe but (it may be) necessary loss. The principle assumed was, that all lands enjoying the privileges and benefits of good government, but at the same time claiming exemption from those burdens or contributions which are the sinews of the state, are bound to make good so peculiar a claim;—such a right must have been acquired—and if acquired, when and how? If it can be proved, then the land is exempted; if not, then it is resumed: and, we believe, that very great facilities, in the matter of proof, were granted to all the parties concerned in so invidious and difficult a process as this resumption-process must have been.

Upon the *principle* or mode of thus resuming lands, and rendering them subject to financial burden, we must be understood as passing no opinion: we now simply endeavour to state and explain the case for the benefit of some of our readers;—and if further, in this imperfect statement of a matter with which we are not officially familiar, although we be not in theory ignorant, we should make any slight mistake or minor omission, the candid reader will not consider that as affecting the independent object we have in view, and to which we are now naturally and in order introduced.

IDOL TEMPLES, MUHAMMADAN MOSQUES and those Colleges which are the advanced nurseries of both, have of course also had their free-tenure-lands to which they laid claim, on the same grounds which other holders of soil, in similar cir-

circumstances, adduced : and the general law for enquiry into the merits of those is the same, to a certain extent, or up to a certain point, with that observed in all other cases of resumption-process. If the charter or other deed of tenure presented, be found legally adequate, the lands are suffered to remain under their former superstitious occupation :—or if, in the absence of documentary evidence, that which is traditional and oral be judicially sustained, the full benefit of continued possession and financial exemption is granted : and should there be any complaint on the merits of the case as involved in the legal enquiry, there is an appeal open on those merits, for a final decision, a decision which may reverse a former and subordinate one. Thus the most ample scope for strict justice is granted ; and there is no room left even for the minutest insinuation, or for the remotest suggestion, that British law manifests any *partiality* AGAINST heathen idolatry or Muhammadan anti-christianism. No, there can be no complaint on *that* side ;—but there is sad ground for complaining of its evident *partiality* FOR those false religions : as will now appear.

Suppose the usual process gone through—and that after every facility has been granted to the occupants of the *temple*-lands or *mosque*-lands, for proving their title both on primary evidence or on further appeal, and that all has failed—so that a just case has been made out for removing those lands from their idolatrous or anti-christian occupancy—an issue in which it might be supposed that Christian men as governors would rejoice—what then follows ? Is such a decision, as in the case of *other* properties similarly affected, put in force ? Are those lands, which have thus been legally freed from false gods, and from the false prophet, *resumed*, as other lands are (with however much hardship) resumed ? By no means. A SPECIAL PRIVILEGE is conferred on *these* occupants, not enjoyed by other occupants :—The Government of India has reserved for itself a gracious prerogative, which it may exercise on behalf of all *temple*-lands, all *mosque*-lands, all *college*-lands, against which unfavourable adjudications have been given—and it requires of its

judicial or financial agents to refer all such unfavourably adjudicated cases, for the consideration and indulgence of such supreme prerogative. There is indeed no reversal of the decision, no interference with its judicial merits ;—it is assumed to be an equitable and necessary decision ;—but there is a *special* favour subsequently bestowed, or it *may* be bestowed (and in either case the *animus* of partiality is the same), in accordance with peculiar and express provisions made for that very purpose, in the Government regulations. Nay, the partiality goes even further : for, lands of a certain extent, that is the *smaller* lands, connected with temples and mosques, are not even to be inquired into ;—they may not even to be subjected to a process or form of trial—they are privileged *in limine*, and must not even be disturbed by a question about their tenures : they might become the revenue-property of Government ; and small as they are in extent, yet many in number, they might be worth something as property, and worth much more as reclamations from evil uses :—but the Government makes a gift of its resumption-chances, and by a deed of financial sacrifice secures all such lands in their idolatrous and Muhammadan tenure.. In these two forms (not to speak of some others which will afterwards appear), the British Government in India makes a *direct and gratuitous grant* of its own interests in property, or of the property itself (when at its free disposal) to the temples of idolatry and the mosques of Muhammad ! Is not this PATRONAGE ? patronage, not from necessity, but from deliberate choice—patronage embodied in legislation, and emanating from high and absolute state-prerogative ? This is that patronage, against which we bring the charge of SPIRITUAL TREASON :—we have asserted its existence ; we have described its elements ; the charge is heavy—What is its PROOF ? We shall give it in detail, documentary detail—and let the reader mark it well.

III. THE PROOF.

The following are extracts from the published enactments or “ REGULATIONS ” of the Indian Government, accessible to

all, and which will not be gainsayed. We shall first quote, and then analyze our quotations—thus fairly bringing to view what they severally contain. There are other documents which are of the *secret* class, not now lawful to publish, but which are in some respects of a still more unfavourable character than those which we adduce: to these we have no access.

(1.)

Regulation XXXI. of 1803—Section II.

“ *Serenth*—Provided however that nothing herein contained shall authorize the subjecting to the payment of revenue any quantity of land, not exceeding ten begahs, held exempt from the payment of revenue under a grant made prior to the first day of January, 1801, and *bond fide appropriated as an endowment for temples or for other religious or charitable purposes*. Moreover if any land so held and appropriated, exceeding ten begahs shall become liable to assessment under the rules contained in this Regulation, and the Judge of the Court before which the suit for the assessment of such land may be depending, or the Collector of the district, if no judicial suit respecting it be depending, shall be of opinion that the immediate assessment of *such* land would be productive of distress, he shall report the same with the circumstances of the case, for the consideration of the Governor General in Council.”

(Analysis of this Regulation.)

1. Certain rent-free grants of land had been made, under certain circumstances, previously to January, 1801 :—and such lands, generally, are declared to be subject to a certain process of resumption, in virtue of which they may become full Government property.

2. But all *temple, mosque and college-lands*, being for RELIGIOUS AND CHARITABLE PURPOSES, shall be held (*ipso facto*) exempted from all process of assessment, provided they be less than ten biggahs in extent;—so that nothing in any other part of this Act, shall be considered as affecting any such property.

3. To make this still more stringent, it is specified that such land, in order to be exempted, must have had its produce “ *bond fide*” appropriated to TEMPLE WORSHIP OR MUHAM-

MADAN SERVICE—that is *really* to idolatry as understood by Hindus, or Muhammadanism, as practised by Musalmáns:—for if the endowment be not so appropriated, it may be resumed or recovered to Government uses.

4. If such land should exceed ten biggahs in extent, and by a resumption-process become liable to revenue-obligations, and if any apparent distress should be occasioned by such a result, as of course there would be in proportion to the popularity of the shrine—then, *are such lands not to be resumed*; but a **SPECIAL REPORT** regarding them is to be forwarded to the **GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL**; for the favourable consideration of the highest authority in the Indian Empire.

5. Thus we find that **TEMPLE-LANDS**, yielding idolatrous endowments, according to this Act, if under a certain amount, are to remain *untouched*, whilst other lands may be resumed—and if they exceed that amount, are to be reserved as a high and special grant to be conferred, if deemed expedient, as a direct Government favour—to “**BONA FIDE**” *idolatry and Muhammadanism*.

(II.)

Circular Orders of the Sudder Board of Revenue, North Western Provinces, dated Allahabad, 30th November, 1841. Published in the Agra Government Gazette of January 4th, 1842.

The Sudder Board of Revenue North Western Provinces, having received instructions from Government, dated 18th ultimo, on the subject of *Maafi* Tenures, I am desired to communicate the following extracts, with the Board's observations on them, for your guidance.

[Para. 4th and 5th, of Government Order:—4th, Nos. I. III. IV. and VI. of the Bengal Rules are sent for the same purpose—*They are to be strictly acted upon in favour of incumbents.*]

BENGAL RULES.

(**RULE I.**) Officers charged with prosecuting claims against Lakheraj Tenures shall not prefer or maintain any suit for lands, not exceeding ten Biggahs which have been held exempt from the payment of revenue or rent without interruption since the 1st December, 1790: provided that in the districts of Chittagong, Sylhet and Cuttack, *this indulgence shall not extend to*

such lands, except where the produce is, BONA FIDE, appropriated as an endowment for TEMPLES, or for other religious or charitable purposes: and that in Cuttack, the proof of rent-free possession without interruption shall not be required in the cases so excepted, beyond the 24th of October, 1803, the date fixed by Cap. VII. Section XVIII. Regulation XII. 1803.

(Analysis.)

1. Certain lands, in Bengal, that are *lakheraj*, not exceeding ten biggahs in extent, and which have been exempted continuously from a certain date, shall not be subject to a resumption suit:—with the exception of the districts in Chittagong, Sylhet and Cuttack—from which in general this privilege is withheld, for certain reasons.

2. But there is an exception even in these excepted districts, on behalf of all lands, of which the produce is, *bonâ fide* appropriated as an endowment for TEMPLES or other religious and charitable purposes;—these shall be subject to no suit.

3. These regulations of the Bengal Government are required to be strictly acted upon in favour of *all incumbents of similar tenurès* in the North-western Provinces—so that every indulgence may be extended to all lands of which the produce is, *bonâ fide*, appropriated to the support of native idolatry and superstition.

(III.)

Bengal Rules (IV.) *Under same head as the former.*

“ If it shall appear in the course of the investigation of any case, that the produce of lands, the revenue of which is claimed for Government (whether the same has been held since 1790, without interruption or not, and whether exceeding ten biggahs in extent, or less) *has been applied consecutively to RELIGIOUS OR CHARITABLE PURPOSES*, or to objects of general utility; it shall be the duty of the officer prosecuting on the part of Government the claim to revenue, to report the fact through the prescribed channels for the consideration and orders of the Government.

(Analysis.)

Here is but a repetition of the same principle. It is supposed that certain lands are subject to the claims of resump-

tion—that the produce of some of these lands has been applied *bond fide* to certain “religious and charitable,” that is idolatrous and superstitious, uses, consecutively without interruption—and it is required that the prosecuting officer shall not in *such* particular case follow up the claim already proved, but shall remit the whole case for the consideration of Government—with the ultimate view, of an indulgent continuance or restitution of the property, for its former uses; so that, if the temple be popular, or the resumption should be followed by “distress” or an unpopular feeling, a political favor may be granted, and a political benefit attained, by not claiming the lands which are due, or the revenues which they produce. The Government in this is its own agent.

(IV.)

Printed Circular Order by the Sudder Board of Revenue, N. W. Provinces—dated Allahabad, May 4th, 1841.

(Pamphlet No. IV. Para. 118, page 444.)

“On the demise of a Pensionary acting in the character of Superintendent of a SHRINE, or *Mujawul* or *Khadim*, and drawing an allowance in trust for its appropriation to objects connected with his ministerial office, the pension is to be considered open to revision, and an application will accordingly be made for the continuance or resumption of the allowance by the Local authorities, *as the popular character of the endowment and THE MERITS OF ITS MINISTERS may or may not justify the continued alienations of the public revenue to its support.* The board direct, that the same principle be applied to all allowances of this kind granted by the late Board of Commissioners, or the Board of Revenue, under Regulation XXIV. of 1803, and Regulation XXII. of 1806. On the death of each incumbent of an establishment enjoying *such* an endowment, it seems desirable that the question of continuance or resumption of *such assignments of public funds should be considered with reference to the claims of the public for the MOST BENEFICIAL EMPLOYMENT OF THE RESOURCES OF THE STATE*;—and the Board have been desired to carry the *spirit* of this view into effect, as references from time to time may be made by the local authorities, on questions growing out of the perpetuity of character supposed to be attached to conditional grants of this nature.”

(Analysis.)

1. The *Superintendents* of certain “*shrines*,” now draw from public money (under Government control) certain allowances or pensions, in trust for that purpose.

2. When any such incumbent of a shrine dies, then his pension or allowance shall be considered as open to revision, and it may be also to resumption, under certain circumstances, which are in regulation prescribed.

3. The *elements* of the case, on which the continuance or discontinuance of the salary must depend shall be, the particular *character* of the shrine and the special *merits* of its ministers:—*if the former be popular, and the latter effective*, and therefore both be meritorious, then shall the shrine allowance be continued and the shrine superintendents paid as before:—but if otherwise, then shall all be withdrawn—and resumed. A **POPULAR** shrine shall receive, an unpopular one shall not.

4. The principle upon which this singular enactment is based, and on which special regard to it is urged upon the officers of Government is, the desirableness that the assignment of public funds should be conducted, with reference to the claims of the public, for **THE MOST BENEFICIAL EMPLOYMENT OF THE RESOURCES OF THE STATE**. This is an intelligible principle;—and simply declares, that the *support of a Muhammadan shrine* may, in India, be considered as a *most beneficial employment* of Government funds.

5. By the spirit and effect of this enactment, the *perpetuation* of superstitious shrines, is secured by the Government of India—and the accomplishing of this (ultimate) object, is committed, with serious legislative solemnity, to all the subordinate agencies, in their varied forms, and scattered stations, over this vast empire. We do not say what the Government *intends*—but we now publish what it orders to be done, and what its ministers are paid to execute—and what therefore it is responsible for maintaining.

REGULATION XIX. 1810.

A Regulation for the due appropriation of the rents and produce of lands granted for the support of *Mosques, Hindu temples, Colleges* and other purposes, &c. &c.

PREAMBLE. Whereas considerable endowments have been granted in land by the preceding Governments of this country, and by individuals, for the support of *Mosques, Hindu Temples, Colleges, and for other pious and beneficial purposes*, and whereas there are grounds to suppose that the produce of such lands is in many instances appropriated *contrary to the intentions of the donors* to the personal use of the individuals in the immediate charge and possession of such endowments; and whereas it is *an important duty of every Government to provide that all such endowments be applied according to the real intent and will of the grantor*, &c. &c.

II. The general *superintendence* of all such lands granted for the support of *Mosques, Hindu temples, Colleges, and for other pious and beneficial purposes*, and of all, &c.—is hereby vested in the Board of Revenue and Board of Commissioners in the several districts subject to the control of those Boards respectively.

III. It shall be the duty of the Board of Revenue and Board of Commissioners to *take care that all endowments made for the maintenance of establishments of the above description be duly appropriated* for the purpose for which they were destined by the Government or individuals by whom such endowments were granted.

V. Under the foregoing rules it will of course *be incumbent on the Board of Revenue and Board of Commissioners to prevent any lands which have been granted for the support of ESTABLISHMENTS OF THE ABOVE DESCRIPTION* from being converted to the private use of individuals or appropriated in any other mode *contrary to the intent and will of the donor*.

(Analysis.)

1. The fact is here adverted to, that, in times past, endowments have been given, in favour of **HINDU TEMPLES, MUHAMMADAN MOSQUES, and COLLEGES**, connected with both these forms of native worship,—as might be expected under Hindu and Muhammadan ascendancy.

2. The **OBJECT** for which these endowments are given, is declared legislatively and politically to be “*pious, beneficial and*

charitable”—and *therefore* to be peculiarly under the care and *patronage* of a wise and good Government.

3. The *object of the original donors* (which was of course the support of *Hindu Polytheism* and *Muhammadanism* and the preserving of an indigenous priesthood) is most closely to be carried out as to the *bond fide* appropriation of their particular endowments—and no misappropriations are to be tolerated.

4. That it is the “important duty” of the Indian as of every Government *to see that all such endowments be applied according to the real intent and will of the grantor*—and that it is the special and immediate duty of all subordinate agents and courts, as of the Board of Revenue and the Boards of Commissioners, to take special care *that all such endowments be duly appropriated for the purpose for which they were destined*, that is, to the maintenance of temples, mosques, and colleges in India. In all this there is no room for the least mistake. The principles are clear, the instructions plain and palpable.

IV. THE SUMMING UP.

Such is an outline of the testimony which we bring against the Government of India, with such analysis as seems more than sufficient to bring out the real substance of the charge already adduced against its anti-christian laws and regulations. We need not amplify or explain, where all is so plain and obvious; but it may be well to sum up all the points involved in the evidence which has been now read;—that all may be distinctly before the mind as one result. Alas! how sad is the statement now to be made.

1. The Government of India has undertaken charge of temples, mosques, and colleges (of false religion), belonging to the people of this country, and has burdened itself with the financial regulation of these: and has done this, not on the ground of a protective toleration even, but with a specific regard to the special ends for which such property was originally destined, to wit, for the support of Hindu and Muhammadan worship and education; or in other words, it *has made itself*

trustee for the civil support, in a vast multitude of cases, of idolatry and anti-christ. Nay, as we shall see, it goes beyond its self-entailed trust, and gives to these false religions property which they had wrongfully used and which never belonged to them.

II. The Government of India in carrying out this voluntary charge, has given to these sinful and anti-christian objects, ruinous also and injurious as they are known to be, the same rank and status in legislative language and financial description with Christianity itself—nay, a higher place than it has yet assigned to true religion: it designates the idolatrous and unchristian objects for which certain endowments are left as “pious,” and “beneficial,”—besides which there are no words left by which to distinguish the institutions of Christianity itself—and so it declares idols and anti-christ to be the very opposite of what Almighty God declares them in His word to be. Can there be any excuse for such use of language as this?

III. The Government of India has taken further and more substantial measures in order to execute its arbitrary trust, than the mere use of nomenclature: it has instituted regulations having for their immediate effect that those “pious,” “beneficial,” and “charitable” objects of patronage shall be executed, under the penalty of privation of privileges where there is a default of *bond fide* compliance:—thus creating, not an official, but officious, righteousness on behalf of evident and unmingled evil—a political righteousness, as uncalled for by man, as it is dishonouring to God—an imaginary righteousness having no foundation but in a gratuitous theory of political fancies and selfish interests blended in one. This is not even toleration;—it is an intolerant toleration—for, it is not even permitting the people to change and do as they will with their own worldly religions.

IV. The Government of India has decreed, that the continuance of endowment to a particular shrine (in certain cases) shall be according to its “popularity;” that is, (to speak as Christians) according to the measure of spiritual delusion and of unchris-

tian abomination, according to the number of idolatrous transgressors and superstitious worshippers, connected with that particular house of sin:—if these be great, then let the shrine be patronized, let its endowment continue:—if they be small, let the scene of them be instantly extinguished. Surely here is a penalty on the fall, but a premium on the rise, of idolatry and anti-christ!—Such may not be the intention, but such is and must be the *effect*:—false religion, being “popular,” shall be paid;—being unpopular, shall be fined:—this is the Indian “sliding-scale,” as applied to heathen shrines.

V. The Government of India has made large pecuniary *sacrifices* for the direct support of Hinduism and Muhammadanism, that is of idolatry and anti-christ; not only by gratuitous salaries to their shrines and schools, for which there was no just claim, but by granting revenue-exemption to many lands connected with such institutes of superstition, which could not otherwise have been exempted; waiving even its own clear rights, and ceding its own clear revenue, in favour of those temples, mosques and colleges, which it might have dealt with, as with others, and might have left to their own just, or inherent resources—granting them their bare civil rights, in so far as humanity’s rights could be pleaded—but conferring no favours, and making no sacrifices. Pecuniary sacrifices are just as really sacrifices as are blazing hecatombs: and the Government of India which renders the one, does as virtually render the other;—sacrifices to idols and anti-christ. No doubt, they ultimately bring, or are supposed to bring, still greater political gain;—but this is only to say, that men sacrifice hypocritically and not sincerely;—and whether of these is worse?

VI. The Government of India acts thus (in almost all cases) *gratuitously*—that is, there is no one who could justly claim from them, that which they so largely bestow. Lands which might, by their own laws, be claimed, are by their own laws not claimed, because they are for “pious and beneficial” purposes:—or, lands which have been claimed, and after

legal process, might have been resumed, are not to be resumed, for the same reasons—and all on the ground of favour—free, unmerited, unclaimed favour:—these lands are in fact a free gift to the worship of idols and the apostleship of Muhammad, to support the one and maintain the other. Special laws too have been passed, modelled and remodelled, embodying and securing this special and arbitrary favour ; so that there may be no doubt, nor mistake, nor forgetfulness, that there does exist such a boon, and that to confer it in abundance, is not merely the law, but also the very *animus* of the donors.

VII. The Government of India has made the execution of these plans and regulations a matter of *special charge* to its servants and agents ; so that in official honour they are bound, according to their particular posts, to see all these orders faithfully performed. True, indeed, many of those gentlemen who have the charge of such trusts as these, have disliked them, or have been disgusted at them, or in some few cases may have declined, or in some other cases neglected them altogether:—but this affects not our case as stated, that the *official* instructions of Government to its servants are of a certain kind—and that those servants are officially bound by the instructions which they have consented to receive. We are dealing with a system, and not with individual men ; and we maintain that the Government of this land has made it a part of the stringent duty of its civil officers, to see to it, that idolatrous and anti-christian endowments be “ *bond fide*” appropriated to idolatrous and anti-christian purposes—and that resumable lands, of the same character, be not resumed, but continued for the promotion of the same evil ends. This *may* be exacted as a part of the CIVIL SERVICE of India—and has it not been performed ?

VIII. The Government of India avows all this, as a matter of POLITICAL PRINCIPLE : there is nothing of it all which it disavows or conceals ; nay, it declares the principle on which it proceeds to be one essential to good and wise government. Here then we have to do, not with a mere local custom, nor an interim

instruction, nor an accidental abuse, nor a superficial conventional practice ;—but with a corporate trust, legislative enactments, political responsibility, State-principle ; of which the sum and substance is this, that in India **HEATHENISM** and **MUHAMMADANISM** shall be specially favoured and financially patronized, as the religions of the country ; that lands and revenue shall be sacrificed for their use ; that their endowments, shall be watched over, as endowments for purposes that are pious and beneficial ;—that thus the original sins of the conquered country, shall become the adopted sins of the conquering state ;—that, in financial regulations the impostor Muhammad shall rank with the blessed **JESUS**—and in political adjustments the idolatrous Pantheon of India shall receive a place with the holy and only God of the universe !

V. THE CONCLUSION.

“ Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter. Fear God and keep His commandments ; for this is the whole duty of man : For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.”

Our case, for the present, is done ;—and we thank God for having afforded us another opportunity of writing truth, and by exposing evil seeking to do good. We have endeavoured to speak plainly, and yet respectfully ; and if we have stated any thing inaccurately, we have done so unconsciously, and are willing to be corrected. If we have acted unjustly towards any, it has been without intention, and after every effort to be sincerely just. If we seem to have betrayed prejudice of mind, we may truly reply, that such prejudice must have overcome bonds of friendship and esteem towards not a few of those who are virtually involved, either by feeling or office, in the charges that have been made. That our effort is vulnerable in its execution, or mode of approach against a tremendous evil, we are fully aware—but that its principle of action, even the revealed will of

God, is perfectly indestructible, we are as certainly assured ; so that, should we fall, this one word of God would remain in all its strength and sharpness, against hell and earth, in India and England, “THOU SHALT HAVE NO OTHER GODS BEFORE (IN THE PRESENCE OF) ME!” That condemns *you*—that saves *us*! We have written seriously ; for, the honour of the one True God and of JESUS CHRIST the only Saviour is to Christians ever a most serious consideration—serious even unto death itself:—aye, serious even unto the Judgment itself. For, soon, very soon, must all concerned in the matters referred to appear before the judgment-seat of HIM, from whom all power cometh, and to whom INDIA belongs. Then shall there be an assembling of “the princes, the governors, the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces,” not as on the plain of Dura, to worship the golden image, (yet India hath her golden image that her rulers worship:)—but the assembling shall be in the valley of the last judgment of the Lord, and before God Himself in the person of JESUS CHRIST! and an account shall there and then be required of all the directors, and governors, and counsellors, and commissioners, and judges, and magistrates, and collectors, and deputies, and assistants, in regard to all the laws that have been enacted, all the instructions that have been issued, all the orders that have been obeyed, all the trusts that have been undertaken, all the monies that have been paid, and all the works that have been executed, during the reign of Christian Britain in Heathen and Muhammadan India! The prospect of that day was a subject of concern even to an Apostle, the holy Paul, who thus writes—“We labour that whether present or absent we may be accepted of the Lord: for, we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad!” If an *Apostle* thus felt and wrote, how ought we to feel and act?

We have not turned aside to consider objections which may be made to the views we have expressed: first, because we really know of none that may not be summed up under that one great head, STATE-EXPEDIENCY, or "worldly policy," which it has been our aim to expose, and which must therefore stand or fall together with the object of our remarks:—and secondly, because if any formidable objection should hereafter appear, it may then have the full advantage of a separate consideration. Of this however we are sure, that no objection can ever be made having so strong claims as the LAW OF GOD, and that no objection can arise which the WORD OF GOD cannot meet and destroy:—and in this conviction we can afford calmly to wait for results. At the same time we have no objection to anticipate and answer *one* special enquiry which may be made of us, and not unreasonably made in the opinion of some, having reference in some degree to matter of *fact*: It is this—"Are not those investigations into rent-free tenures now nearly concluded throughout the country—and is not therefore the time *now* gone by for taking this matter up and agitating its merits?" To this we reply—Nay; the time is by no means gone by for bringing forward our present case: For,—1. The laws or regulations in question have not been repealed; and consequently the objectionable, or anti-christian principle which pervades them, has not yet been disowned by Government;—until this be done, the evil complained of has a real, a political, and an avowed existence:—and to destroy this existence utterly, in every form, is our aim. 2. It is desirable that the Christian public should be furnished with this new and strong proof of the *animus* which *still* actuates this Government on the subject of idolatry and false religion in this country. There have been Orders of late, in the past year, (to which *we* can have no access for *publication*) as offensive as any former ones on this subject;—and men in power know, that on the *principle* there has been no change whatever up to this hour. 3. If Christian or public vigilance be aroused to

further enquiry, this sad anti-christian tendency on the part of our rulers may be found lurking in *other* quarters where it is now not known or suspected—and so the whole of this hateful and obnoxious system be brought to public execution. 4. Although almost all the pending suits have been brought to a close, and there may seem to be but little occasion in present circumstances for continuing the resumption process,—yet there may be (and present events make this very likely) further accessions of territory made to this empire, and the whole system may be again called unto active exercise, unless now it be checked for ever. 5. If throughout the country many portions of land have been released from taxation, on the sole and specific condition that the produce of the lands so released shall be applied to the maintenance of idol temples and mosques; as is the case: and if the holders of such lands should in many cases (as actual experience has already shewn that they will) prefer appropriating these revenues to themselves, and allowing their trusts to fall into decay—then will the Christian servants of the Indian Government be again called upon to interfere in this unchristian affair, and be required to enforce the *bond fide* application of those idolatrous and Muhammadan endowments again to their anti-christian ends. We cannot indeed justify the men who should consent thus to sin; but we must do what we can to deliver them from temptation—even as we pray for ourselves, “Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil!”

Could we now reach the Government of India, we would say, “In the name of GOD and of the LORD JESUS CHRIST, whom ye now dishonour, cease from your sin, and *rescind* your sinful regulations!” Could we reach the Honourable body of its servants, we would say, “In the same Holy name, cease from your sin, and constrain your masters to *rescind*!” And could we reach the Christian public of India and Britain, we would say, “Arise, and demand of these Indian powers—in the name of our common GOD and SAVIOUR, demand of them

that their Acts which patronize the Hindu Pantheon and the Muhammadan Anti-christ be *rescinded* !”—For, we can see no alternative, between such *Rescission*, and continued *Treason*—constructive, SPIRITUAL TREASON !

J. M. D.

THE ORATORIO.

TEKEL—THOU ART WEIGHED IN THE BALANCES,
AND ART FOUND WANTING.—*Daniel.*

CALCUTTA:

PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, CIRCULAR ROAD.

1840.

THE ORATORIO.

"Abhor that which is evil."—"Abstain from all appearance of evil."—"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."—"He that doubteth is condemned; because, not of faith."—"Prove all things."

These are plain and direct statements of holy writ. They declare the duty of every believer in the Bible, in regard to EVIL. Does evil exist? "*Abhor*" it, in its very nature and principle. Is evil under any appearance, or of any kind, presented to you for participation or commission? Then "*abstain*" from it. Is there any thing proposed to you of which you have no "faith" or persuasion that it is right before God? then to do that thing, in that state of mind, is *sin*. And what is the consequence of such sin? You are "condemned" for it in the sight of God; and on this plain ground, that to be indifferent about the right or wrong of an action is itself an evil principle. Words cannot be plainer or more direct than these, as to the duty of Christians, in regard to the evil which exists and abounds in the world. Let any man who regards the revealed will of God as the supreme standard of his heart and life, of his principles and his actions, of his enjoyments and pursuits, turn to these passages for himself, and he will find, that, in their original connexion and evident application, they mean what has now been said—they are found in Rom. xii. 9, 1 Thess. v. 22, Rom. xiv. 23.

Now let us apply this to the subject of this paper. *If* the Oratorio be evil, then a Christian is bound to abhor it—if it be presented to him, then is he bound to abstain from it—if he attend it, not being convinced that it is a right thing, he sins—and if he so sin, he is condemned of God; and surely no good man would purchase, or desire to purchase, his pleasures at such a price. Those therefore who would please God, whilst desiring to please themselves, will certainly inquire, "Is the Oratorio a good or an evil thing? Am I sure that it is right to attend it? Can I go to it without doubt, judging by all the light which I have, or can have on the subject? Have I reason to believe that God will justify or condemn me in this proposed act, taking His revealed mind as my standard of decision?"—This leads us naturally to the last passage prefixed, the divine command, "*Prove all things*:"—that is, in application to the Oratorio, "*Prove it*"—"make proof of it," as is done to metals—bring it to that test of Christian practice,

to which all things shall be brought on the judgment day, and by which alone we can with certainty judge now ;—if it abide that test, then receive it ; if not, reject it.

Now here our subject divides itself into two parts—the *first*, what is the Oratorio ? and the *second*, what saith the Law regarding it ?—In the first, we may consider the *elements* of the case ; and in the second, the *merits* of the case.

I. The *Oratorio*, says one of the most popular of our lexicons, “ signifies a kind of sacred drama, generally taken from the scriptures, and set to music.” This is a definition which will not be disputed. The word is Italian ; and at once points out to us the origin of the thing itself, which was devotional, or connected with Church-worship. In a land where the devotion of the senses was mistaken for that of the spirit, and where “ the lust of the eye, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life,” soon became ministers of the altar, music was carried out beyond its just proportions, and in various forms absorbed the devotions of men. The land of “ Opera” gives name, as well as origin, to the “ Oratorio :”—the former however was purely secular, the latter was purely religious ;—the one was designed for the theatre, the other only for the church. In process of time the Oratorio has been sundered from its primary relation to the house and worship of God—it is conjoined with the Opera in its objects, and all its concomitants, so as to be distinguishable only in name and subject ;—the same orchestra performs them, the same auditors attend them, the same programme contains them, the same day includes them, the same motives in attending them are avowed—the play, the concert, the ball, the Oratorio, are but *one* now in the eye of the world.

Still however the Oratorio maintains the *internal* character given in the definition. It is a kind of “ sacred drama”—a continuous representation in words, of certain events or objects revealed in Holy writ, and generally in the very words of scripture :—the verbal is accompanied by musical representation, in which it is attempted, by the power of music, to convey certain ideas corresponding with the character of the words, or of the action described in the words. Thus in the grand Oratorio of the MESSIAH by Handel, there is a continued verbal and musical representation of the history of our Lord Jesus Christ from His birth to the final judgment, and to the Halleluiah Chorus of the redeemed in Heavenly Glory—and this is given in about fifty texts of scripture, selected as the most descriptive, and put together in the most effective manner, the whole being set to music of the highest order. The effect of such a composition is strictly dramatic, if we only substitute the idea of verbal and musical acting, for that which is scenic and personal. The same principle applies to the Oratorio of the Creation, only its words are not so literally scriptural, although the subject of representation is equally sacred and holy. The successive scenes of creation—the productive energy of the Eternal Spirit of God—the sublime words of Jehovah, “ Let there be light”—and the grand first truths of religion as declared in Ps. xix., “ The heavens tell forth the glory of God,” &c.—are successively introduced in this an-

cred opera. The musical representation of Chaos in this piece, with all its grand concords and splendid discords, is considered as one of the highest displays of representative music, and as one of the nearest approaches of sound to sight in the communication of ideas.

These two Oratorios are placed by general consent at the head of all sacred music with which we are acquainted ;—and, by the advocates of such musical performances, these are ever pointed to as the noblest and most sublime. Now be it observed, that these embody the two most sacred subjects in the universe, the *Creation* of the world by God, and the *Redemption* of it by the same Glorious Lord as Messiah. Out of the former springs our existence as creatures of the Almighty, with all our relations, duties and awful responsibilities :—out of the latter, springs our existence as Christians, redeemed sinners, heirs of eternal life and glory !—The former event was the revelation of God the Creator, the latter was the revelation of God the Saviour :—the former made us accountable, the latter has rendered us salvable. *These* then are the *themes* of our two chief Oratorios—*subjects* divine—*words* sacred—the supreme *object* in both is ALMIGHTY GOD himself—and the *acts* His works of Creation and Redemption—the *mode*, musical representation—the avowed *object*, the love of music—the *accompaniments* in nine cases out of ten, operatic and orchestral selections—as if by a public and palpable (though silent) index, to demonstrate the latent end of the whole. With the intentions of the composers of these pieces, we have nothing to do—neither have we any thing at present to do with the uses to which such splendid productions *might* be turned, if consecrated solely to the service of God—we now speak of that which has been and now is. The Oratorio as practised at present, whether in Europe or India, is “ a kind of sacred drama, generally taken from the Scriptures, set to music,” and performed for *public amusement*, as certainly as the Tragedy of “ Othello,” the “ Comedy of Errors,” the Pantomime of “ the Magic Rose,” the opera of “ Der Freyschutz,” or the “ Overture to Jupiter,” or the “ Men of Prometheus.” In short, the Oratorio is now a *sacred subject* turned into a *worldly amusement*—the *music* alone is sought and considered—and he who would attend the Oratorio as a *devotional* exercise, or a *scriptural* service, would be hailed with the smile of doubt, the sarcasm of scorn, or the gaze of wonder.

II. We have thus considered the Oratorio in its practice—let us now turn to examine its merits as good or evil.

Here we are ready to admit that the *music* of an Oratorio, like any other music in the abstract, is quite lawful and good—that the melody and harmony of sound combined in it, constitute one of the *sweetest* pleasures of this world, and one of the highest delights of which the senses are cognizant. An ear for music is a sweet gift of God, which his servants in all ages, who have possessed it, have prized, and used in his service. The “ saint, the savage and the sage” have alike felt its power—and the sweet notes of the voice, or of the instrument, are witnesses to the goodness of Him who has made *sound* the medium, not of benefit only, but also of pleasure.

We are ready also to admit that the *words* of the Oratorio are not only, as such, unexceptionable, but are of the purest and loftiest description—they are in fact divine—and this is the very burden of our complaint. In this respect the Oratorio is immeasurably above the mass of vocal music employed in our common worldly concerts;—in the latter, song is too generally but the expression of fallen human passion, or depraved human feeling, from which every thing holy or heavenly is carefully excluded—in the former, the language in itself is a part of that very truth which is given to sanctify and save the children of men.

Were the strains of the Oratorio employed for the object of the Bible revelation,—were this even the *avowed* object, as in the public praises of the sanctuary—then might we glory in such a manifestation of love to God and devotedness to His worship. Did men thus meet together to sing, chaunt or recite those words “The Heavens tell forth,” &c., or that grand Heavenly Chorus, “Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever!”—did our Town Halls resound with such words as these in their very spirit and for their very original object, who that loves God and His Christ, would not rejoice and say, Truly His kingdom is come, for His will is now done and sung on earth as it is in Heaven! All these things we admit, and rejoice in admitting—for we love music above any other mere earthly pleasure of which the senses are cognizant; and we love the words of God far above all music however dear and sweet;—but, this admission affects not the merits of the case now under consideration.

We object not to music, we object not to sacred things; but, we object to and condemn all musical representation of sacred things for mere worldly amusement, for mere musical entertainment. This we hold to be sinful, on this clause of Divine Law, “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain—for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.” This commandment evidently forbids every light, irreverent and unworthy use of this Blessed name, in whatever form. It forbids all false swearing—all unnecessary oaths for civil purposes—all flippant appeals to the name of the Almighty in common conversation—all hypocritical mention of God in external devotion—(for there is a complaint against those who honour Him with the lips, whilst the heart is far from Him);—and where is the right-minded man, who cannot perceive that when the name of God is used for the *mere* purpose of musical entertainment, and where the undeniable object is to exalt the *powers of music*, and not to magnify the power of Jehovah, that in such a case the name of God is used “in vain?” that is, “in vain” as to *Him*, whose name it is? Were He considered as supreme in the enactment of the Oratorio; and were the conventional end of it to magnify His name by the direct consecration of music to Him, then, as we have already seen, the result would be different. But, when the name of the Almighty is subordinate and used only for the sake of the accompanying music, then is it most manifestly taken in a “vain” manner. Now, what applies to the name of God, applies to *all* that is *divine* in His nature;—

such are the *perfections* of God considered as His ; such are His *operations* considered as His also—and such too is *Revelation* when regarding as proceeding from Him :—to use therefore these in the manner above described, for the mere enhancement of music, or the entertainment of the public, is an act in direct violation of that command which has been already quoted. If I make an unbecoming use of my friend's *name*, *actions* or *correspondence*, it is considered by the world itself as a *personal injury* :—much more must this principle apply to that *name* which is “above every name”—and to that *word* which is “exalted above all His name”—and to those *works* which constitute the substance of that word of glory ? May we not on this occasion apply those words of the Apostle and say, “The invisible things of Him from the CREATION of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and GODHEAD—so that they are *without excuse* ;—because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened ; professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the Glory of the incorruptible God”—into *what* ? (for here the parallel ceases)—into a *common concert* of vocal and instrumental music, for public musical entertainment ; into an *Oratorio* of the “Creation” of God Almighty, accompanied by a selection of profane Italian song and popular operatic music, the theme of the play-house, and the favorite strains of the public orchestra ! If the praises of the Almighty are thus to be offered up at the feet of public *Taste*, and if the words and works of Godhead are thus presented as incense at the shrine of *music* as a common pleasure, and all without sin—then may we indeed say with the sweet-singer of Israel, “If the foundations are destroyed, what shall the righteous do !”

Even the fable of “*Jupiter*” and “*Prometheus*” (names lately in public entertainment associated with those of God and his Spirit) might bear a little witness in such a matter ;—for, “when Prometheus made men of clay, and *stole fire from heaven* to animate them, Jupiter being angry, sent him to be perpetually punished by the gnawing of a vulture.” Let professed christians learn from the “Men of Prometheus” themselves, that even the votaries of Jupiter deemed it sacrilege to steal fire from the heavenly altar for the purposes of human pride or human vanity. When the men of Bethshemesh of old looked into the sacred ark of the Lord with profane curiosity, He smote of the people fifty thousand and three score and ten men—and the men of Bethshemesh said, “Who is able to stand before this Holy Lord God ?” When Belshazzar of old too made a feast at Babylon, and caused to be brought out the sacred vessels which were taken out of the house of God in Jerusalem, it is written, “The king and his princes and his wives and his concubines drank in them—they drank wine and praised the gods of gold and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone ; In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace ; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote : Then the king's countenance was changed and his thoughts troubled him, so

that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another." In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain! "Now these things are our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted and fell." Those are remarkable words of the inspired writer—"OUR GOD IS A CONSUMING FIRE!" The God of *us* Christians, as well as of the Jews, is a "consuming fire." And this is actually stated for an object corresponding with that for which we now contend; warning the Hebrews against irreverence and presumption, the writer says, "Let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and with godly fear; FOR, *our God is a consuming fire!*"—Surely then it is neither right nor safe, in the sight of an omnipresent God, to utter the holy strains of an Oratorio for the conventional end of worldly amusement, or musical enjoyment. Let wise men judge, whether even a *doubt*, on such a subject, be not weighty enough in its consequences to merit caution and candour; and whether to act in the face of such a doubt, where the glory of God is involved, be not worthy of condemnation. To us nothing seems plainer than the fact, that the Oratorio is, as a public amusement, a direct, thorough, and public violation of the third commandment of the moral law—that it infers a sin of the same order with Polytheism, image worship and Sabbath-breaking, forbidden in the other three commandments of the first table—that God "will not hold guiltless" those who for mere musical purposes profane his holy name, either as performers or auditors:—and, guilty before God we leave them.

To the view of the subject which has now been laid down, exception has been taken by some and speciously urged by others—and it may not be out of place to glance at what is so said on the other side of the question.—Not that we have ever met with an *argument* in defence of the Oratorio as a public amusement—although we have met with the sneer, the scoff, the insinuation, the vituperation, the calumny and the falsehood, which have been the hereditary weapons of those who hate strict obedience to the word of the Lord from the days of Cain to the present hour—not, we say, that we have yet met with an argument which could take off the edge of the third commandment as applicable to the common Oratorio—yet still we may notice one or two of those attempts at reply, which have ventured into the light.

It is said, "Is not the musical part of the services of the *sanctuary* a *little Oratorio*, performed every Sabbath day?" True—if you please; but this is only a confirmation of *our* argument. What would you say to the *prayers* of the sanctuary being rhetorically spoken, and recitations from the prayers of your Church given, for the *same* end and in the same manner? And where is the difference between these two, prayer and praise, save this that the latter is more the service of the Heavenly world than the former? What would you say to the chaunting of Italian song in the immediate sequence of the Holy services of the sanctuary? Is this the Oratorio? Judge ye.

But, "it is the custom of Britain, it is even the custom of Europe, to have the Oratorio; and even *serious* Christians attend it." Be it so—it has been the custom of the world to sin from the beginning, but

is sin not therefore to be protested against? Is there such a thing as a legal right to sin, either through prescriptive custom, or a prevailing majority? The Christian regards the Law of his God only; and, in doing so, he sets the Infinity of One against the numbers of the world, and the eternity of his Lord against the duration of human custom—he laughs to scorn the idea of being ruled by the multitude or by the wise few. His King is one, and his commands are ten; and these may be summed up into two. Europe, Britain, London, Calcutta, are mere fellow-subjects in his sight—they must stand or fall as he does—therefore such an appeal is lost on him. As to “serious” Christians, much as he may question a fact, to which his own knowledge and experience run counter, and which is supported on no competent authority, he will yet further doubt, whether their attendance has been the result of *serious* prayer, of *serious* meditation on the law of God, of *serious* regard to the interests of the church of Christ, of *serious* concern for personal sanctification, and of *serious* contemplation of the coming of the Lord.—Oh, “*serious* Christian,” say, is the Oratorio a scene in the midst of which you would wish to render up your spirit to that Blessed Lord, who by his own blood hath “redeemed it from this present evil world?” Sincerely indeed may such a Christian pray, “From sudden death deliver me!” But we maintain on the other hand that the Oratorio has been a subject of reprobation and condemnation with a multitude of “righteous over much” Christians in Britain for the last fifty years. Just before the commencement of that period a grand commemoration of Handel was held, by the performance of the Oratorio of the Messiah, in London; and out of that circumstance arose that able and popular volume of sermons, (also termed “the Messiah,”) by the well-known friend of Cowper, John Newton, minister of St. Mary, Woolnoth. From that time till now there has ever been a band of “righteous over much” Christians to protest against the unchristian profanity of the Oratorio—and the leading Religious Journal of England, annually and almost monthly pours forth its well directed artillery upon the laical and clerical partizans of such wretched compromise. These things are not done in a corner, and why then are some ignorant? Whether it be new or not in Calcutta (and those who have lived longest in it can best tell), for Christian ministers to protest against such things, it is not new in Britain—and we shall append to this article a short *British* extract, which will at least take off the edge of novelty from this subject. We are treading a path in which we see the footsteps of many saints; and even if we did not see such, we are satisfied, for we see God there, when we see His Law.

There are some who would plead a *special* exemption from the application of our argument to men in general, by saying, that “it may be *possible* to attend devoutly and enjoy seriously the Oratorio, so as actually to be benefited by it.” The self-deception of the sincere, and the hypocrisy of the false, are so endlessly ramified, as well as deeply rooted, that it is impossible to say whether the theorist in this case knows or believes what he says—but even if he does, it affects not our cause in the least. For our appeal is not to the opinion or even alleged experience of an *individual man*, but to the plain *law of the Eternal*

God. If the common Oratorio be a breach of that law, it is evil; and it were perfectly vain even for an archangel to tell us that he could be benefited by countenancing sin. Let it not be said that this is "begging the question;" by no means—for this objection is not a reply to our former premises that the celebration of the Oratorio is a breach of the third commandment; it is a mere individual difficulty thrown in our way to entangle our progress after we have carried our first grand position. We thus then deal with it and say, "Search and try your supposed edification, and see whether your devotion has not been more sensual than spiritual;—see also, whether you are not more desirous of *supposing* that you have received benefit, than sure that you have attained it."

But granting that there has been benefit derived during the performance of an Oratorio, does this alone prove that it is good? A man may have witnessed a murder, and been benefited; a man may have been hearer of a volley of oaths, and been benefited; but *not directly*. A man may have been so singularly abstracted from other circumstances, as to have fastened only on the words of scripture, and meditated on the omnipotence of God or on the love of Messiah, whilst others were entranced with the burst and flow of sound; but what honest man would from such a supposed exception maintain, that the *conventional object* of the Oratorio was to magnify the Lord, or to commune with Christ?—No—the very necessity which exists for urging such an individual exemption is a giving up of the question on its general basis. So must it ever be; where the principle is bad, but the practice sweet, there will never be wanting a soft tempter within to say, "Cast thyself down from thence, for it is written, 'He shall give His angels charge over thee to keep thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.'" But what said our Lord to these specious words—"It is written, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God!'" Objector, go and do likewise!—seek not safety on the precipice—seek not devotion in the operatic Oratorio!—"Happy is he which condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth."

The plea is sometimes urged also, that Oratorios are generally "got up" to serve some *charitable* object, in regard to individuals or institutions, and therefore that men may set down their names or give their presence on such occasions, merely for the *sake of the charity*. Now there is no acute man of the world who is not aware that is a specious *fallacy*. For, is the *end*, in this case, good? Of course, charity, or alms-giving is good. But what are the *means* employed for this end? Are *they* good? Determine this with us first on the abstract ground, and then we shall come to the full decision. If the public Oratorio as formerly considered be good, then the question is settled without regard to the charity, and so two good deeds are done instead of one;—but if the Oratorio be evil, then two evil deeds are done instead of none; for then evil is done that good may come, and the outward good becomes a real sin, for it was only a lure to the sin;—in such a case, (apart from personal motives,) the "Charity" becomes a sanctified temptation! In these days the world dances for joy, that it may give food to the starving; it sings in merriment, that it may give clothes to the naked; it

performs comedies and farces, that it may console the widow and comfort the fatherless ; it calls a mighty feast of all manner of dainty viands for itself, that it may by a mighty effort save them that are ready to perish ! Oh pure, lovely and disinterested charity ! Oh benevolent and self-denied world ! how mighty thy influence, how beautifully adapted thy means and thine ends ! Thou callest the gospel foolishness, and its ministers enthusiasts—but where is wisdom and sobriety like *thine* ? Thou dancest, and behold charity appears !—Thou singest, and behold benevolence springs forth !—Thou playest on thy stage, and alms flow out from its boards !—Thou feedest thyself gorgeously at thy public board, and immediately thy love goes forth ! Nay, when thou wouldest be universal in thine act, when thou wouldest promote music and devotion, pleasure and religion, amusement and charity—when thou wouldest honour the masterpieces of man, and magnify the word of the Almighty ;—when thou wouldest reward thyself, glorify the Author of thy being, and bless thy servants in one sweep, then thou enactest the “ Oratorio of Creation,” or representest in music the awful solemnities of human Redemption ! Oh wise, pure and lovely world !—*Christian*, is this what thy Lord called charity ? Is this the charity by which you would be tried in that great day when the Judge Messiah shall say, “ Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me !” Was your charity at the Oratorio done unto Him ? Oh, “ let Love be without dissimulation !” Our Master’s love was seen on the cross ; and think you, does the world expect to see ours at the concert ? Our Master said, “ It is more blessed to give than to receive,” and He gave Himself for man. Go thou and do likewise, and thou wilt not need the melody and harmony of music, sweet as indeed they are, to solicit or extract thine alms.

Once more, and we are done with objections or replies, if they be worthy of the name. It has been said by some, “ *all* our ministers do not oppose these things—but some of them by their names, and others by their presence, countenance the Oratorio.” So it has been spoken, and so it has been printed, and so it has been published. The fact is indisputable, and undenied. We were aware that it was expected it would be so, and we now know that it is so. We retract not one syllable that we have written—we alter not one jot or tittle, where the plain commandment of God is concerned, no, not from deference to that office with which we ourselves have been invested even as well as they. If we have *erred* in our zeal for the law of our common Lord, then let our error be exposed. The subject has excited much and serious discussion amongst men who are neither scoffers, calumniators, nor selfish despots of public opinion—it has been talked of on the basis of its own merits, by members of the flock of Christ, and those not to be despised for poverty, ignorance, or obscurity (if a Christian minister can consider these as grounds of distraction)—some, not unknown or uninfluential in society, have come to a decided opinion and have acted upon it. Others have said, “ Where ministers go, shall we halt ?”—All this is no secret—and the world understands how to use the discovery. To Christians we would say, remember that even Paul was once obliged to withstand Peter to the face for dissimulation through the fear of man,

and desire to please the Jews—and remember also the Bereans, of whom it is said that they were, more noble than others, because that whilst “they heard the word readily, they *searched whether these things were so or not.*” The Bible, the Bible is the religion of Christians—it is the only rule of faith and practice. Turn to the scene on Sinai,—consider what it tells of God—and see whether you could then sit down and chaunt in the strains of the Oratorio, for the amusement of the public, these solemn words—“Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain* !” J. M. D.

II.

Extracts from Newton on the Oratorio.

“Whereunto shall we liken the people of this generation, and to what are they like? I represent to myself a number of persons of various characters, involved in one common charge of high treason. They are already in a state of confinement, but not yet brought to their trial. The facts, however, are so plain, and the evidence against them so strong and pointed, that there is not the least doubt of their guilt being fully proved, and that nothing but a pardon can preserve them from punishment. In this situation, it should seem their wisdom, to avail themselves of every expedient in their power for obtaining mercy. But they are entirely regardless of their danger, and wholly taken up with contriving methods of amusing themselves, that they may pass away the term of their imprisonment with as much cheerfulness as possible. Among other resources, they call in the assistance of music. And amidst a great variety of subjects in this way, they are particularly pleased with one. They chuse to make the solemnities of their impending trial, the character of their Judge, the methods of his procedure, and the awful sentence to which they are exposed, the groundwork of a musical entertainment. And, as if they were quite unconcerned in the event, their attention is chiefly fixed upon the skill of the composer, in adapting the style of his music to the very solemn language and subject with which they are trifling. The King, however, out of his great clemency and compassion towards those who have no pity for themselves, prevents them with his goodness. Undesired by them, he sends them a gracious message. He assures them that he is unwilling they should suffer: he requires, yea, he entreats them to submit. He points out a way in which their confession and submission shall be certainly accepted; and in this way, which he condescends to prescribe, he offers them a free and a full pardon. But instead of taking a single step towards a compliance with his goodness, they set his message likewise to music; and this, together with a description of their present state, and of the fearful doom awaiting them if they continue obstinate, is sung for their diversion, accompanied with the sound of cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of instruments. Surely, if such a case as I have supposed could be found in real life, though I

* The above appeared in the CHRISTIAN OBSERVER, on occasion of the Oratorio performed in Calcutta in February 1839.

might admire the musical taste of these people, I should commiserate their insensibility!

"But is not this case more than a supposition? Is it not in the most serious sense actually realized amongst ourselves? I should insult your understandings, if I judged a long application necessary. I know my supposition *must* already have led your thoughts to the subject of the *Messiah*, and to the spirit and temper of at least the greater part of the performers, and of the audiences. The holy Scripture concludes all mankind under sin. It charges them all with treason and rebellion against the great sovereign Lawgiver and Benefactor; and declares the misery to which, as sinners, we are obnoxious. But God is long-suffering, and waits to be gracious. The stroke of death, which would instantly place us before his awful tribunal, is still suspended. In the mean time he affords us his gospel, by which he assures us there is forgiveness with him. He informs us of a Saviour, and that of his great love to sinners, he has given his only Son to be an atonement and mediator, in favour of all who shall sue for mercy in his name. The character of this Saviour, his unspeakable love, his dreadful sufferings, the agonies he endured in Gethsemane, and upon the cross, are made known to us. And as his past humiliation, so his present glory, and his invitation to come to him for pardon and eternal life, are largely declared. These are the principal points expressed in the passages of the *Messiah*. Mr. Handel, who set them to music, has been commemorated and praised, many years after his death, in a place professedly devoted to the praise and worship of God; yea, (if I am not misinformed) the stated worship of God in that place suspended for a considerable time, that it might be duly prepared for the commemoration of Mr. Handel. But alas! how few are disposed to praise and commemorate MESSIAH himself! The same great truths, divested of the music, when delivered from the pulpit, are heard by many admirers of the Oratorio with indifference, too often with contempt.

* * * * *

"Having thus, as I conceived myself bound in duty, plainly and publicly delivered my sentiments, of the great impropriety of making the fundamental truths of Christianity the subject of a public amusement, I leave what I have said to your serious reflections, hoping it will not be forgotten; for I do not mean to trouble you often with a repetition of it."

* * * * *

"It is probable, that those of my hearers who admire this Oratorio, and are often present when it is performed, may think me harsh and singular in my opinion, that of all our musical compositions this is the most improper for a public entertainment. But while it continues to be equally acceptable, whether performed in a church, or in the theatre, and while the greater part of the performers and of the audience are the same in both places, I can rate it no higher than as one of the many fashionable amusements which mark the character of this age of dissipation. Though the subject be serious and solemn in the highest sense, yea, for this very reason, and though the music is, in a striking manner, adapted to the subject, yet, if the far greater part of the

people who frequent the Oratorio, are evidently unaffected by the Redeemer's love, and uninfluenced by his commands, I am afraid it is no better than a profanation of the Name and Truths of God, a crucifying the Son of God afresh. You must judge for yourselves. If you think differently from me, you will act accordingly. Yet permit me to hope and to pray, that the next time you hear the Messiah, God may bring something that you have heard in the course of these Sermons, nearly connected with the peace and welfare of your souls, effectually to your remembrance." Sermon, Rev. v. 13.

III.

The following is an Extract from a letter addressed by the Rev. Leigh Richmond to his wife.

"The approaching grand musical festival, to be held at Edinburgh about the same week with that at Northampton, occasions almost daily discussion in every party where we are visiting, and there is about one feeling amongst all our Christian friends,—that no serious and consistent Christian will go. Mary*, of course, hears nothing from either her father's lips, or from those of all his estimable friends on this side of the Tweed, but determined objections to the whole plan, *its accompaniments, its gaiety, its dissipation*, its ensnaring character, and its inconsistency with every principle of non-conformity to the world. Neither she nor I could appear again in Scotland in a religious, and much less a missionary character, if we were to be present at these amusements. How, then, can I do otherwise, which from my heart I sincerely, seriously and deliberately must, than condemn the same thing, as it concerns dear F—?

"I have never had but one opinion on the subject of these prostitutions of religion and music, at these theatrical, and, as I think, unwarrantable medleys. I wish you had the sentiments of dear John Newton, on the public Oratorio of the "Messiah," at hand†. I deeply lament that any, who, in other respects, so justly deserved the name of consistent Christians, should so little fathom the corruptions of their own hearts, and be so insensible to the dangerous tendency of public amusements, which unite all the levity of the world with the professed sanctity of religious performances. Think not that I blame any one except myself, for not long since making my sentiments on this ensnaring subject better known to those so near and dear to me. It is somewhat singular, that I should, with many Christian friends of all ranks in Edinburgh and Scotland, be making a firm stand against the principle and the practice of a musical festival held here, at the very time that I must also make as firm a stand against the same thing in the South. It is contrary to every feeling I can entertain on the subject. We have fore-sworn all these things on principle; and what is religious character and credit worth, if consistency is to be sacrificed? Numerous as my faults and errors may be, I hope to be preserved from ever deliberately con-

* His eldest daughter, who accompanied him during this tour to Scotland.

† Given above, No. 11..

senting that my children, of whatever age, should enter into societies, intimacies, or amusements, which I deem forbidden, so as to wound my conscience."

IV.

The following is to a Christian Friend in England.

"I can truly, deliberately, and conscientiously, add to the testimony of my friend Pellatt, that I do consider the ordinary musical festivals, conducted as they are, amid a strange medley of wanton confusion and most impure mixtures, as highly delusive, fascinating, and dangerous to youth. I consider the Oratorio performances in Churches, as a solemn mockery of God, and forbidden by the clear principles of the Gospel. The making the most sacred and solemn subjects which heaven ever revealed to man, even to the passion of Christ himself on the cross, a matter for the gay, critical, undevout recreation of individuals, who avowedly assemble for any purpose but that of worship; and who, if they did, could hardly pretend that it were very practicable in such company, and on such an occasion, I do from my heart believe to be highly offensive to God. Play-house actors and singers (frequently persons of exceptionable character) are hired, supported, applauded, and almost idolized, in these exhibitions, and encouraged to persevere in their immoral and dangerous profession. Vice rides triumphantly in such proceedings. I am happy to say that in the instance of the festival at Edinburgh, none of the serious people, either Ministers or Laymen, have countenanced it with their presence, excepting two Clergymen, one of whom left the Oratorio in the midst of the performance, shocked and confounded at the abuse of holy things, and ashamed of being found there: the other is deemed by all his brethren to have acted very wrongly, and to have countenanced much evil. The spirit of the world, the pride of life, the lust of the eye, all enter into these public gaieties; and their false pretensions to partial sacredness, only render them more objectionable. If young people do not learn this lesson early, they will greatly suffer in all hope of their spirituality. The less they may now, in the infancy of their Christian state, see and feel this, the more dangerous it is to yield to their ignorance and inexperience. What is morally and religiously wrong, can never become right through the error of youth. And it would be strange departure from every moral and religious principle, to say,—'I know an act to be wrong in itself, but my child has not grace enough to see it as I do; therefore I may lawfully permit him to do what I know to be wrong.' Would not this open a door to every species of sin and error?

"As to examples of good people:—sin does not cease to be sin, because some good people unhappily fall into the snares which the great enemy of souls spreads for their delusion. It is, and it shall be, for a lamentation, that good men err so deplorably, and thereby countenance what eventually their principles condemn, and what they may some day have deep cause to regret.

"No man in England loves music,—sacred music, better than I do; therefore my sacrifice to principle and conscience is far greater than

that of many others. I ought to have the greater credit for my self-denial ; but I dare not countenance sin and danger, because it is clothed in the bewitching garb of good music and pretended sanctity. ' Let not my soul come into their assembly ! ' Tender and affectionate husband and father, as I hope I am, however I may sometimes be misapprehended, and consequently sorry to interfere with the comfort of those most near and dear to me, yet I rejoice from my heart, in having prevented the sanctioning any part of so promiscuous and unjustifiable a medley, by the attendance of any of the members of my dear family : and they will one day thank me. When the act is avowedly an act of worship, all is right, let who will sing and play ; but when it is avowedly an act of amusement, religion, rightly felt and understood, forbids the profane performance of singing-men and singing-women, trifling with the things that belong to our everlasting peace, and turning them into mockery."

V.

Extract from a recent "Record" and Sermon of the Rev. F. Close, of Cheltenham.

" We very much rejoice to find that the serio-comic exhibition at Gloucester during the past week has been denounced from the pulpit by one who from his station, his abilities, and his past services in the cause of morals and true religion, is well entitled to be heard on the occasion. The Rev. Francis Close, the incumbent of Cheltenham (from which place a large influx of visitors to the festival was anticipated), thus addressed his people on the previous Sabbath. We admire his faithfulness, and we trust a great blessing from God will mark His approbation of it.

" ' There are other amusements, less obviously inconsistent with "*the love of the Father*," in which the great majority of pious persons think it wrong to participate. They are aware that the specious garment of a charitable object is cast over them ; that the hallowed sanction of religious services is in a measure imparted to them, by introductory prayers, and even the preaching of a sermon : but when they view the *Music Meeting* as a whole,—when they investigate more narrowly its details and its accompaniments, they are forced to the conclusion that it is " not of the Father, but of the world."

" ' It appears to them little short of an open desecration of the house of God to interrupt its sacred services by the workman's hammer, to erect lofty galleries, with gaudy trappings, to which a splendid and fashionable company may be admitted by purchase as to a public amusement,—to engage, at vast expense, the servants of the opera and the stage,—(persons whose ordinary pursuits remove them beyond the pale even of religious profession ;)—NOT "*to sing to the praise and the glory of God*,"—but to produce the finest instrumental and vocal effects, for the gratification of the taste of the audience ; and this, too, at the risk of another and far more heinous profanation, viz. that of the most solemn, awful and spiritual language of the word of God itself : these things give infinite pain to many whose souls are imbued

with a jealous love for the honour of their God, and the hallowed nature of his word and of his house.

"Charmed as they might be with the melody and the song, they cannot divest themselves of the persuasion that the continual repetition of God's holy name by persons of this description, paid for public amusement, is a direct breach of the commandment, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain!' And some of the recent attempts, to imitate the proceedings of the judgment-day, the last trumpet, and even the voice of the Son of God himself, appear to them little short of profaneness and impiety! And when, as in the approaching festival, we find the levities and improprieties of a fancy-dress ball appended to these religious amusements, the whole appears such a strange and heterogeneous union of religion and irreligion, of things sacred and profane, that we hesitate not to apply to it the language of St. John, in the text, 'All that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but of the world.' While, therefore, upon such occasions each one must judge for himself—and to his own master he must give an account—I could not deliver my own conscience without faithfully protesting against *such* amusements as, if possible, more dangerous to young persons, or to the inexperienced Christian, than some others which are more palpably dissipated; and for this reason, that they are garnished with seeming propriety, with the profession of benevolence, and the services of religion; while those who attend them are hurried on from the cathedral to the concert-room, and from the concert to the fancy-dress ball; and if in that scene of dissipation and folly we find not those 'pomp and vanities of this wicked world,' which we have all professed to renounce at our baptism, it were difficult to discover them anywhere. The 'wiles and devices' of the 'God of this world' may be ingeniously interwoven with the amusements of the present week, but true Christians will not be deluded by them. May the eyes of many be opened to see 'the end of these things.'"

VI.

A Pastoral Letter on the Oratorio, from a Minister in England to his Flock.

MY BELOVED FRIENDS,—Your welfare lies near my heart. That your soul should prosper, and be in health, is my fondest wish. To hear that my spiritual children walk in the truth is my richest joy. That my feeble ministrations should contribute to either of these results is my liveliest encouragement in my work of faith and labour of love. Just in proportion, however, to the gratification your spiritual weal will confer, is the pain I feel when any thing in your conduct gives me the slightest occasion to apprehend that your high and holy principles are less influential with you than they should be. I rejoice, indeed, that I am not constrained to say with the anguished apostle, "Many walk of whom I have told you often, and now tell you, even weeping, that

they are the enemies of the cross of Christ ;" (Phil. iii. 18) that I am not even forced to pass upon any the mitigated censure, "I stand in doubt of you." (Gal. iv. 20.) Still I must say, that a recent occurrence has filled me with anxiety, lest you should inadvertently be led away into a seeming approval of that which I am persuaded your judgment, if brought to bear upon it, and your piety will lead you to condemn.

That you may be aided in arriving at that conclusion, which I conscientiously believe to be scriptural and true, I have thrown together a few thoughts in the simplest phrase and most inartificial order, having in view, not so much to commend myself to your critical tastes, as to commend the truth to your heart, conscience, and understanding. The question suggested by the occurrence to which I have already alluded, and to which I thus invite your attention, is—"Are we authorized to use SACRED MUSIC upon *ordinary occasions*, or for *secular objects*? *How far are those fashionable entertainments, called ORATORIOS, sanctioned by the principles of revealed truth, and how far are they deserving of the countenance of Christians?* Are they sanctioned at all; are they worthy of countenance at all, on the principles just named?"

I believe not. I conceive that the nature of such compositions places them beyond the range of *amusements*; and that Scripture, and good taste, and correct feeling, forbid their employment for such a purpose. Let me beg your patient and candid attention to the few remarks I have to make on this point, in which I shall give you the calm unimpassioned expression of my opinion, the result of deliberate reflection, and not the crudities of precipitation, nor the impetuosities of prejudice. I will tell you boldly and plainly what I think of them—yet gravely and collectedly. I will withhold nothing—"nothing extenuate;" you will therefore expect no mincing and delicate phrase; neither will I "set down aught in malice," so that I shall render justice to those who differ with me in sentiment.

No Christian, I conceive, will dispute my *first* position—that it is wrong to make sacred things mere food for entertainment, and that the wrongfulness of doing so bears exact proportion to the sacredness of the object desecrated. Now an oratorio, whether we regard its name or structure, is an address or series of addresses to God, "the greatest and best." It is, if rightly performed, an act of worship. Praise and prayer are the loftiest occupations of created beings. They annihilate infinity, and place the soul in apposition with God. To do that then for amusement alone, which offered from a pure heart, and with correct motives, is the highest homage of the creature to the perfections of the Creator, I cannot but call a gross profanation. Of course I here reflect chiefly upon the employment of *sacred words* for such a purpose; because music, properly speaking, can have no sacredness in it, although there is a style of composition to which we may, with conventional propriety, apply the name. It is not then to the instrumental department of such a performance I now refer, the stateliness of whose march, and gravity of whose tone, may comport with the solemn character of the words; but to the making *such* words the vehicle of conveying to the ear "the concord of sweet sounds" they accompany,

the string upon which the rich pearly-notes of the music are strung, and which thus play but a subordinate part in the performance.

Now, not in one case out of a thousand, in which these performances are exhibited, are the words, the sentiments, the song, the chief attraction. The chief attraction is the *music*, and the *skill* of the vocalist. Neither the performers nor the audience pretend that an oratorio is an act of worship, the grateful homage of reasonable men to the God of their life.

To bring down then "the high praises of our God," the words of the Holy Ghost, the eternal verities of Scripture, to the level of a sing-song or burletta; to reduce the hallelujahs of the sweet singer of Israel to a mere instrument, upon which some popular artist may display the flexibility and compass of his voice—Oh! this is a use of the sanctities of scripture, from which every right thinking, not to say pious mind, must I conceive, revolt.

But it will be said, are not very solemn and delightful emotions produced in every heart by the performance of the oratorio? Yes, I reply; there are certainly very pleasing emotions produced, and of a very sober, perhaps solemn cast, while you are under the spell of such performances. But there are two very grievous mistakes committed by those who advocate their continuance upon this plea, if, indeed, they be not intended sophisms. The one is, that the *words* are the source of these feelings; and the other is, that these feelings are *religious*.

Now I contend that it is not the words, but the *music* which awakens the emotions described, as any one may easily ascertain who is familiar with the music of our best known and most highly prized oratorios. The man must have ears of felt and a leaden heart who is not overpowered by the thunder of sound which bursts from an orchestra boasting hundreds of performers—melted by the softness of some touching melody, and won to admiration by the blended sweetness and skill of the symphony.

But that oratorios owe their effect, in any great degree, to the *words*, is contradicted further by the rule that prevails in those entertainments which are professedly *profane*, (I use the term simply as notative of a class, and not in an invidious sense.) In the *Opera*, who regards the words, except as the accompaniment of the music? Which abide most in memory, the words or the notes of a favorite song? Which affects us most, the numbers of the music, or the rhythm of the poetry? And, finally, which part of the opera is most laboured, because most attractive, popular, and impressive, as most likely to bestow fame and recompense upon the composer, the overture or the airs adapted to words? The *overture*, undoubtedly, as any one knows who knows any thing of music. It is by their *overtures* our best composers make their deepest impression, and win their way to wealth and immortality. Now this rule, I maintain, applies, in all its breadth, to the case in hand. It is to the sweet solemn powerful harmonies, and not to the sweetness, solemnity, or power of the language of our oratorios, that we are to trace their influence on the mind. They affect us, not because their themes are grave, and true, and scriptural, but because the measure of

the music is mighty and majestic—mighty as the voice of the storm, and majestic as the march of night.

But the other mistake is, that these feelings are *religious*. Persons generally, when they hear a sweet and solemn anthem, and are strongly moved thereby, have, as it were, the very depths of their being stirred within them, and give themselves credit straightway for being very devout; whereas it is demonstrable, from the philosophy of sound, to which I simply refer, that the effect upon their frame is purely physical. Certain vibrations have been produced in the air by the boards and strings of the instruments performing; these have produced a corresponding vibration on their organs of sense, and their nature has been affected in consequence in a definite manner—in a manner which an accurate physiologist can clearly describe as generally applicable, and which an intimate friend, acquainted with the peculiar temperament of the individual, could find no difficulty of predicting in his particular case.

In this simple statement, without entering into detail or illustration, the whole secret is out—the riddle read. It is a physical effect, bearing exact relation to the amount of the physical cause. The devotion of the affair becomes purely a question of nervous susceptibility, a devotion that, in the East, would probably dance with the whirling *dervishes* as readily as here it melts or glows, adores or weeps, at the oratorio.

Now, be it borne in mind, that no feeling is religious which has not direct reference to God; which does not spring from a *right motive*—a heart-love for him; is not shaped in its acting by a *right rule*—respect for his words; and is not aiming at a *right end*—his glory. Compare with this the religion of the oratorio. People go to it either ignorant of what they are to experience, or to renew their past feelings at the entertainment, with no higher object, however, in either case, than mere amusement; and their pleasurable feeling assumes, it may be, a serious and pensive cast, (the richest, sweetest shape it can put on,) and thus, *pleasure* their motive, aim and experience, they can so deceive themselves as to miscall it *piety*. We surely do such persons no more than justice when we say, they are neither correct philosophers, nor acute analysts, nor scriptural theologians, nor experimental pietists. The motive, the rule, the end, are throughout wrong; therefore the oratorio cannot, in the sense assumed, be by any means, the hand-maid of true devotion.

The subject matter of oratorios being sacred, is, to my apprehension, sufficient for their condemnation, upon the grounds of *reason and good taste*. God, the soul, heaven, hell, eternity, made the matter of a song! that song intended as a pastime for a pleasant hour; not a preparative and assistant to devotion! It is awful to think of, repulsive, shocking! It is offensive to *reason*, to common sense. Of this, the excellent and venerable John Newton makes a strong and lively representation in his *Messiah*.

But it is equally condemned by *good taste and decent sensibility*. While this general objection lies against all representations of this nature, it applies with special emphasis to the subject matter of some oratorios, which are more than commonly censurable. Who, for instance,

could bear to see the death of some dear relation, a father or mother, enacted upon the stage ; or, if thrown into numbers, make it an amusement to listen to the song ?

Is not such an event one of those desolating calamities, from the contemplation of which the mind instinctively recoils, and which you would fain blot out of the memory for ever ? Be your feelings, however, on this subject strong or weak, you could not, at least, countenance those, nor feel any sympathy with those, whose sensibilities on the subject being less lively than your own, could make the sanctities of that death chamber an antidote to *enauwi*—a pleasant contrivance to kill time. You look at the event in one point of view, the irreparable loss it occasioned ; you recur to it with an undying grief, and never think of the last groan, gasp, look of the dead, but you exclaim with sickening heart, “ It is no dream, and I am desolate.” They look upon it simply as a very clever show, a vastly interesting spectacle.

But, to bring our analogy still closer ; who could bear to see the death of a martyred friend—a bosom friend and generous benefactor,—made the subject of a tragedy, a spectacle to amuse the vulgar ; or the theme of a song, intended as much to show the composer’s skill who prepared the accompaniment, or the singer’s mastery of the gamut, as the virtues of the deceased ? Suppose all that poetry, and music, and execution, and voice, could do to represent the atrocious deed in all its atrocity—the mournful catastrophe in all its mournfulness—who, with the feelings of a *man*, much less those of a *friend*, could set out to see the deceased again expire ; to hear again the unrighteous sentence of the judge, the ribald execration of the crowd, the forgiving prayer, the God-like benediction of the victim, and, at last, with painful and vivid veri-similitude, the cries, the groans, the convulsed and choking sobs of the dying man ? No man, I venture to predict, with the heart of a man, could endure such a representation as this, the sufferer being his friend and benefactor. It would call for nerves of adamant and not of human fibre to endure it. It would be a moral crucifixion ; it would be a torture only second to that of the hapless hero of the play or song ; and it would be a sin, not only against all that is high and honourable, and noble and generous, and endearing and delicate, but against humanity itself. How then will they exculpate themselves from the blackness of this sin, who can, at the oratorio, hear the sufferings and death of the Son of God, it may be, alternate with chorus from the opera, or the air from the concert room ? How can they endure the scene which the witchery of poesy and music has conjured up in living semblance before their eyes ? Methinks if they felt any thing like human beings, the place would be one *Bochim*—one place of tears. The voice of loud weeping would drown the sad music of the piece, and the air vibrate less to trump and quivering string, than the frame of the audience with the strong spasm of sympathetic agony. Did we feel it as we ought, nature would writhe under the *infiction* at the oratorio as it writhes under the knife, and we should shun it as enfeebled patients do the rush and onset of over-excitement.

For, oh ! where is the friend, where the benefactor, where the martyr like the Son of God ? Where one with such claims upon our ve-

neration, gratitude and love? Where was there ever such stainless purity? Where such lofty benevolence? Where such un murmuring patience? Where such unbroken obedience? Where such self-denial, self-sacrifice, self-forgetfulness? and where, oh where, such sufferings and such love?

Forgive us, O thou Bleeding Lamb! that we feel so little sympathy with thee, thou first, best, changeless friend of man! Forgive us that we hear, read, speak of unmoved, "thy sore dismay, thy deep distress." Forgive us that we are steeped in such Lethean apathy of soul, that we can make thy tears, and sighs, and groans, the pastime of our leisure, and the *pabulum* of our appetite for pleasure; thy cries our sport, thine agonies our delight! O deep degeneracy of our nature! O accursed fruit of our fall! O diabolic hardness of our heart! God alone can forgive such aggravated sin.

"O Lamb of God! that takest away the sins of the world,

"Have mercy upon us!

"O Lamb of God! that takest away the sins of the world,

"Grant us thy peace!"

To thee, uncreated Son of the Eternal, look we for forgiveness! To thee, who wert "slain for us," is our plea, appeal, earnest supplication! And well to thee may we appeal, thou insulted Lamb! though thee we have offended—though thee we have thus "crucified afresh," and appeared almost consenting unto thy death! *For thou art God, and not man*, else we had been consumed in our misdeeds. Divine clemency alone could pardon such unnatural guilt; creature forbearance would have wasted away under this gross outrage upon decency, propriety, devotion, love. Spare us then, in mercy spare, and we will thus offend no more.

Yours, &c.

D.

VII.

Protest published and circulated against the Oratorio performed in Calcutta, in December 1839.

Calcutta, December 13, 1839.

An intimation has appeared in the public prints, that it is intended to perform in the Town Hall of this city, on the 23rd instant, a "Selection from the Oratorio of the Messiah;" a piece which, as is well known, is designed by words and music to represent the grand work of human Redemption by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and which consists of some of the most solemn and affecting passages on this awful subject, that are to be found in the Holy Scripture.

As the performance of this Oratorio is not for a devotional end, but for the purpose of yielding entertainment, and thus securing gain; and as it therefore necessarily involves in it the profaning of God's most sacred name, the desecrating of His holy word, and the degradation of the Divine theme of Redemption, we, the undersigned, deem it our bounden duty to publish our solemn and united PROTEST against it; and earnestly and affectionately to entreat our fellow-Christians of

every denomination in this place, to abstain from giving it their countenance and support.

In taking this step we are actuated solely by the deep conviction, that such a performance is offensive to Almighty God ; and we are the rather impelled to make public this conviction, because we have reason to think that some may be led to attend it under the impression that it partakes of the nature of a religious service.

(Signed) JAMES CHARLES, D. D. *Senior Minister of St. Andrew's Church,*
 R. B. BOSWELL, B. A. *Minister of St. James's Church.*
 W. H. MEIKLEJOHN, *Junior Minister of St. Andrew's Church.*
 R. B. BOYES, B. A. *Junior Chaplain, Old Church.*
 A. GARSTIN, *Minister of St. Thomas's (Free School) Church.*
 T. SANDYS, *Church Missionary,*
 J. W. ALEXANDER.
 R. MOLLOY.
 G. ALEXANDER.
 C. W. SMITH.
 A. BEATTIE.
 J. HAWKINS.
 G. J. MORRIS.
 J. LOWIS.
 C. TUCKER.
 F. MILLETT.
 W. N. GARRETT.
 A. GRANT.
 J. M. VOS.
 W. YATES, *Missionary Minister.*
 T. BOAZ, *Pastor of Union Chapel.*
 J. MACDONALD, *Missionary Minister*
 D. EWART, *Missionary Minister.*
 T. SMITH, *Missionary Minister.*
 G. GOGERLY, *Missionary Minister.*
 W. MORTON, *Missionary Minister.*
 A. F. LACROIX, *Missionary Minister.*
 J. D. ELLIS, *Missionary Minister.*
 J. WENGER, *Missionary Minister.*
 W. H. PEARCE, *Missionary Minister.*
 F. TUCKER, B. A. *Pastor of Circular Road Chapel.*
 J. THOMAS, *Missionary Minister.*
 F. WYBROW, *Missionary Minister (added by request).*

WHAT IS MEANT

BY THE

INDISCRIMINATE CIRCULATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

Being the substance of a Speech delivered by the Rev. Dr. Duff, in the Town Hall of Calcutta, on Friday evening, the 11th November, at the celebration of the Twenty-first Anniversary of the Bible Association.

Dr. Duff commenced by pointing out the distinction between the Bible Society and the Bible Association. Though kindred and co-operative institutions, these were entirely distinct as to the peculiar functions which they attempted to discharge, and the specific objects which they proposed to accomplish. The agreement and the distinction might be very simply illustrated. Suppose a country visited by universal famine—and in the train of famine, its usual concomitant, a universal pestilence. What would be the requisition of philanthropy in the view of a calamity so tremendous? Would it not be, first, by means of one set of agencies, to open up and organize in every city and province and district, depots or repositories, stored with abundance of wholesome provision and healing medicaments? But, what, if the wretched people were every where so prostrated by starvation, so debilitated by disease, that they were either unable or unwilling to come and receive the needed supplies! What, in such a case, would be necessary in order to turn the benevolent labours of the first set of agencies, in replenishing store-houses with wholesome aliment and healing drugs, to profitable account? Would it not be, to set into operation a second set of agencies, for the express purpose of opening the store-houses and carrying forth their contents, from village to village, hamlet to hamlet, and family to family?—for the express purpose of knocking at the door of the famished and the diseased, applying the appropriate remedies, and accompanying and following up the whole restorative process by reasonable donations of nourishing food?

This was the picture of civil, morally and spiritually. For each had its been visited with universal spiritual famine and universal spiritual disease. What then was to be done? The word of God—that most precious of all Books—the Bible—by the appointment of Heaven itself, constituted a salve for every spiritual wound, a remedy for every spiritual disease, a supply for every spiritual want. Were one set of agencies had been set on foot, with the express view of circulating in every city, province and district, depots of Bibles, inundated into the various languages? And was not this a mighty achievement?—might, in the world which it traversed, might, in

the consequences which were expected to follow. Now this was the *specific achievement* which the *Bible Society* had undertaken, and to no great an extent, under the blessing of God, had so successfully executed! But, what, though Bible depositories have been replenished at a vast expenditure of time, strength, and pecuniary resources—what, if the wretched people are every where so impotent and paralysed by famine and disease, as to be at once unable and unwilling to come and be healed by a balm more efficacious than that of Gilead—to come and be fed by a bread more nutritive than the manna in the wilderness? What could be done, in such a case, but to call into active being a *second set* of agencies, for the express purpose of emptying the Bible depots?—for the express purpose of conveying their varied treasures to the poor, the needy, the diseased, and the dying?—for the express purpose of probing every wound, watching the progress of cure, and supplying the aliment fitted for recruiting and renovated natures? And was not this, too, a noble and philanthropic achievement? It was so, beyond all debate. Now, this was the *specific achievement* which the *Bible Association* had undertaken for the city of Calcutta and its neighbourhood, and which, as the Report read this evening indicated, it had, to so large an extent, been privileged to accomplish. Thus the Bible Society and the Bible Association beautifully co-operated, as friendly and inseparable allies. The former say, "By means of purchase, or of new translations, we shall replenish the Depots with Bibles in every tongue and dialect in use amongst this benighted people." The latter come forward and say, "Very well, we shall take your Bibles, either as free grants or at reduced rates, and with these in our hands we shall go forth among the people, knocking at the door of every house, and of every heart—expostulating, persuading, urging, expounding—leaving copies indiscriminately with all who, in the end, may be found able and willing to give them a candid and careful and diligent perusal." This was the theory of the Bible Association—a theory, which it had endeavoured to carry out systematically, subject only to such variations as must ever arise from unforeseen contingencies, and the discretionary judgment which must of necessity be allowed to a diversity of agents that act conscientiously under a solemn sense of their responsibility to God.

But, hark, a voice reached us from afar! It was a deep, hollow, sepulchral voice—a voice, from the tombs of what was thought a bygone superstition! We had all fondly imagined that in our own happy native land—ah, how happy, if it only knew its own happiness!—every remnant of the age of "cowls, hoods, and habits, with their wearers" had long since been "tossed and scattered into rags." We had dotingly been dreaming that every thing characteristic of the age of "relics, bonds, indulgences, dispensations, pardons, bulls," had long since become "the sport of winds." We had too confidently concluded that all of these, with their associated dogmas and institutions and delusions, upbribeled aloft, had long since fled "o'er the back side of the world far off, into a limbo large and broad, since called the Paradise of fools." All this and much more we had earnestly concluded, or imagined, or dreamt. But, hark!—from this conclusion, imagination, or dream, we were suddenly startled by a strange voice. It seemed but an echo or faint reprobation of that which was wont in days of yore, to pass its awful thunder down the Vatican over the cowering and prostrate nations? For, what was its import—for some fit announcement? Why, its import was simply this, in substance as the speaker uttered, it seemed to address us in some such words as these—"O ye dissenting, unorthodox, untheological, unscriptural, unchristian members of Calcutta Bible Society, and of the Bible Association, what are you doing?"

What right have you to go about distributing the Bible indiscriminately? Beware, desist!—also peril the certainty of being anathematized, if so severe is a source of procedure so unwarranted and so dangerous? Was he not right in saying, that this was a mimic reflection of the voice that was wont, in times of old, to growl and thunder from the Vatican? or,—to speak in the language of truth and soberness—the language of Jehovah's holy oracles—the voice of the Scarlet Whore, seated on the seven hills, "the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth, drunken with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus?—a voice, which of late had been strangely re-echoed from the very bosom of disgraced and outraged Protestantism—delighting itself in the names of Puseyism, Tractarianism, or, maybe, Anglo-Catholicism—whose chief vocation, however unintentional, seemed to be to give a fair colour of truth and propriety, to the most ridiculous and monstrous opinions and practices!

Though somewhat startled by the unexpectedness of such a voice from such a quarter, he (Dr. Duff) was not to be frightened either into a precipitate surrender or a tame acquiescence. He dared to ask, why they should be thus rudely threatened and interrupted in their distributive operations? And first of all he received for answer certain playful jokes and witty jests on the supposed meanings of the word "indiscriminate," and the supposed contradictions among the advocates of Bible circulation in their use of it. But was this altogether candid or ingenuous? Did they really not know that the import of such a word, both as to its limitation and its latitude, must always depend on the nature of the subject, to which it was applied, and the nature of the object which he had in view who applied it? And did not all this pre-suppose the exercise of common sense and common honesty on the part of those who were to interpret it? When we spoke of the "indiscriminate voraciousness of the glutton," did not the nature of the subject at once determine, without the aid of any scholastic definition, that this voraciousness was limited to all things ordinarily eatable by human beings? And would it indicate much sense, if any one were to pick off his witticisms, as if we used the term in its most unbounded sense, without any limitation, at all?—as if our assertion were, that the glutton's indiscriminate voraciousness extended to his eating straw with the ox, or grass with the cows, or carrion with the ravenous vulture? Again, when we spoke of preaching the Gospel *indiscriminately to every creature*, did not the nature of the subject at once decide, that it was to be proclaimed to every creature endowed with rational intelligence, without distinction of rich or poor, high or low, learned or unlearned, Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free, male or female?—to every creature who had understanding to comprehend, or a heart to feel, or a soul to be saved? And would it argue the possession of sound judgment were any one practically to emulate the example of the worthy monk of the middle ages, who construed the commandment to "preach the Gospel to every creature" in its most literal sense and unlimited application?—and who, under the influence of such mistaken construction, gravely concluded that, as his dark fellow-habitants of the cloister and its precincts—the brood and colony of venerable crows—were beyond all question "creatures," that is, created beings, so, his commandment must inevitably include them too? And thus did the sage monk, in accordance with his peculiar notion of *indiscriminate* preaching, really, daily in the morning to preach to the crows! Lastly, when we spoke of distributing the Bible *indiscriminately*, did not the nature of the subject sufficiently point out, as already briefly explained, what was really meant by the term? When first introduced by Protestants in this connection, was it not in contradistinction to the Papal dogma and practice of restricting the

Word of God wholly to the clergy or priestly caste—and shutting it out wholly from the vast mass of the laity? Between these two classes, the Papists had raised up a wall of separation;—the clergy monopolizing every thing connected with God's word and ordinances and worship—while the laity were peaceably dispossessed of their noblest birthright as men, and their noblest privileges as Christians. In opposition to such lines and walls of demarcation, the Protestants proclaimed that,—as the Bereans were commended for their diligent reading of the Scriptures, and our Saviour had enjoined all to search them, and convicted the Pharisees of error because they knew them not—so, must the Scriptures be regarded as the precious heritage of all, and consequently, must be distributed to *all*—freely to all—to all alike—without any respect whatever to the man-invented distinctions of laity and clergy;—to all, of whatever nation, or clime, or age, or sex, who were found *able* and *willing* to peruse them! In this sober and rational and duly circumscribed sense, and yet in contradistinction to the lawless restrictions of Popery, we said, without any fear of being misunderstood by candid and honourable men, that we did advocate and practise the *indiscriminate* distribution of the Bible. But if any one chose to allege, by way of jesting at our expense, but chiefly to expose his own folly, that we pled for the demented procedure of the monk of the middle ages;—that we pled for the circulation of the Bible *indiscriminately*, in the all-embracing sense of imparting it literally to *every creature*—to embryos and idiots, to sucklings at the breast and the childish illiterate who could not read, to the scoffing crow who condemned and the senselessly apathetic who cared not for it, to the self-sufficient proud who swore they would not peruse, and the swinish multitude or “lewd fellows of the baser sort” who might instantly turn round and rend it to pieces before our eyes;—if any thing so frantic or so foolish were insinuated against us, then did we indignantly repel the vile insinuation, and in contradistinction to such lawless latitude so wantonly imputed to us, did we declare, without any fear of being misunderstood by candid and honourable men, that we did not advocate or practise the *indiscriminate* distribution of the Bible. And between these two declarations, of *distributing indiscriminately* in contrariety to unwarranted Popish or Puseyite restrictions, and of *not distributing indiscriminately* in contrariety to alleged Protestant latitudinarianism, no really sane or candid or honest mind could possibly detect the semblance or the shadow of a contradiction.

Still, the voice of Romanism and its submissive and imitative, though somewhat cruelly disowned daughter, Puseyism, was neither satisfied nor silenced. Failing, by jests, or jokes, or puns or conundrums—the swift shooting progeny of ill-furnished heads and ill-regulated hearts—to fasten naked follies or stark staring contradictions upon us, the Romanist and the Puseyite alike united in denouncing the indiscriminate circulation of the Bible, even in our sober and limited sense, without being at least accompanied by some infallible interpretation!

Here Dr. D. paused again, to ask, where was this infallible interpretation to be found? The first answer usually was, “In the Church.” Noting that words were intended to be signs or symbols of ideas, he proceeded to ask, what they meant by the term “Church?” With most of the Scripture senses of that term Protestants had long been familiar, and had accurately embodied the same in their various standards and confessions. We knew of the Church, i. e. the *elect*—the *elect* or *chosen* people of God—who met for worship and administration of ordinances in the private unconnected dwelling-house of a fellow-sinner. We knew of the Church of a larger and wider community of the faithful, in

different lands, assembling it might be in different outward edifices, but inwardly united in the bonds of a common faith, a common discipline, and a common salvation. We knew of the universal Church of *true believers* since the world began, or now existing in the four quarters of the earth. And we knew of the Church and general Assembly of the *Angels* born in heaven—who chaunt their hallelujahs before the throne. But we soon found that none of these senses, or all of them put together, suited the views which our opponents entertained of that *awful and mysterious something*, which they so emphatically denominate, *THE CHURCH*! Where, then, were we to go in quest of this oracular dame—this awe-inspiring mother—this more than Delphian Pythoness? We had heard of the Greek Church, the Syrian Church, the Nestorian Church, the Coptic Church, the Abyssinian Church, the Moravian Church, the Lutheran Church, the Helvetic Church, the English Church, the Scottish Church, the American Church, and the Romish Church. Did all these unitedly constitute *THE CHURCH*? If so, we might as well attempt to elicit harmony and order from the dark pavilion, where Chaos reigned, and “Rumour next, and Chance, and Tumult, and Confusion, all embroiled, and Discord with a thousand various mouths”—might as well expect to extract nectar and ambrosia from the horrid cauldron of monstrous and prodigious things prepared by the witches in Macbeth—as attempt or expect to deduce any thing approaching to a consistent or uniform, not to talk of infallible, interpretation, from such heterogeneous and contradictory materials. Where, then, were we to go for *THE CHURCH*? If it be any one of those now enumerated, which is *that one*? The Papist replies unhesitatingly, “The Church of Rome.” The out and out Puseyite as unhesitatingly responds to the decision; since to him the Anglo-Catholic Church is precious, only in so far as he is pleased to delude himself with the revolting fiction that she is a veritable branch of the “Holy Roman Catholic Church.” This, then, was *THE CHURCH* which alone had infallible authority to interpret the Bible, and impose her infallible interpretations on the consciences of all men. We ask for the proof of her possessing such an awful authority. If a reply be condescended upon, we are referred to the Bible for the authoritative evidence! That is, we are referred for proof to that very book, the meaning of which we cannot possibly comprehend, till the referring party has *previously* announced and imposed upon us its own infallible interpretations!! What a mockery is this! What a glaring example of the “begging of the question” and the “reasoning in a circle,” both united? Thanks be to God that the inspiration and consequent infallibility of the Bible rest upon a rock of irrefragable evidence, altogether independent of the officious patronizing dicta of the Church of Rome! Thanks be to God, that in the Bible itself there is not “one jot nor tittle,” to indicate that the Divine attribute of infallibility was ever designed to be conferred on that Church, concerning which, on the contrary, it was distinctly foretold, that she should be distinguished for her “lying wonders with all deceivableness of unrighteousness!” Thanks be to God, that all the authority for such arrogant pretensions rests upon nothing better, nothing higher, nothing more stable than her own lying glosses and deceitful interpretations of the word of life!

But, even momentarily admitting, for the sake of settling the matter a little further, that infallibility is in the Church of Rome—Where, within the bosom and walls of that Church, is it to be found? Who is the Depository of so transcendental a trust? A thorough-paced Romaniist replies, “The Pope!” “The Pope, who is the Vicar of Christ and Viceroy of God upon earth!”—i. e. The Pope, who by assuming such impious titles, but too plainly proves himself to be in very deed that “Apostate man of sin” whom the

Lord has doomed to be "consumed with the spirit of his mouth, and destroyed with the brightness of his coming!" But, apart from this astounding assumption altogether, we flatly deny, yes, can positively disprove his pretended infallibility. For, what is meant by *infallibility*? Is it not something more than simple actual guiltlessness of error? Is it not a downright *incapability* of error? What, then, says *History* to this high pretension? Wholly irrespective of the scandalously immoral lives of many of the Popes, some of whom have been denounced by candid Romanists themselves as "monsters of wickedness," only look at the decisions and counter-decisions of different Popes, the edicts and counter-edicts, the bulls and counter-bulls, the anathemas and counter-anathemas! And if you can satisfy us that black is the same as white, bitter the same as sweet, light the same as darkness, Christ the same as Belial, then, but not till then, will you satisfy us of the uniform infallibility of the Popes! It is a shocking fiction—as revoltingly untrue to the facts of authentic history, as it is impiously blasphemous against God.

Here it is that the moderate Romanist begins to take alarm; and, in the hypocritical, accommodating, and blandly complaisant spirit of Bossuet, he ventures to suggest that the infallibility does *not rest in the Pope personally*. If not, where does it rest? He smoothly and softly whispers, "In the *Church universal* with the Pope at its head." Very well. What is meant by the *Church universal*? Does it mean the entire body of Romanists, lay and clerical? No, No. The laity have nothing to do with it. What, then? The whole body of the ordained clergy. Very good. Has the *whole body* of the canonical clergy been ever called together—ever assembled in one place—to rid themselves in their aggregate and collective capacity, of their conjoint infallibility in the interpretation of Scripture?—and have they left such infallible interpretation as an inestimable and imperishable legacy to the world? No. The *whole body* of the clergy have never been so convened; and from the very nature of the case, never can be. What then has been done to obtain the infallible interpretation of the universal Church with the Pope at its head? Why, truly, from among the thousands and tens of thousands of the clergy, a few hundreds of presbyters, bishops, cardinals, and such like dignitaries, have been summoned together to one place. So, these then have given the infallible interpretation of the universal Church? Why, really, wonders never cease. A mere section—a mere fragment—a mere fractional segment of the universal Church is held to be equivalent to, and identically one and the same as the universal Church itself! Hitherto, we have been accustomed in arithmetic and geometry, to reckon, in our simplicity, that "the whole is greater than a part." And this we have presumptuously exalted into the rank of a first truth—an intuitive principle—an indisputable axiom! Henceforward we must remember the famous maxim of the dark ages, "that what is philosophically true may be theologically false." And regardless of what may be true in the philosophy of ordinary arithmetic or ordinary geometry, we must henceforth bear in mind, that, in the philosophy of Church arithmetic and ecclesiastical geometry, it must be held as incontrovertibly true, that "the whole is equal to a part," or conversely, that "a part is equal to the whole!"

Galled by such unceremonious questioning, and probing, and sifting, the Romanist at length takes fire, and turning suddenly round, attempts to crush the free spirit of rational inquiry, as he can neither meet, nor satisfy it. "Be silent, Sir, be silent," says he, "what right have you to exercise your own private judgment in such matters at all?" Indeed, respond we, this is a contradiction to the whole affair. What is meant by this

exhortation, when stripped of its verbiage, or translated into plainer terms? Is it not simply this?—"God has given you the faculty of a reasonable creature; but you must either pluck it out, or at least you must not exercise it. In other words, God has endowed you with the power of thinking, discriminating, judging; but you must not think at all, or you must allow us to think for you." And this is the address of one fallible worm of the dust to another equally fallible worm of the dust! Might not the Romanist just as wisely and rationally say, "God has given you eyes, ears, and other organs of sense; these too are fallible; do not therefore trust them; pluck them out, or at least do not use them, and allow us to see and hear for you!—us, whose organs of seeing and hearing are equally fallible with your own!"—Thus have we gone to the Romish Church in quest of an infallible interpretation; and the end is that we can only get it when we agree to divest ourselves of the highest function of a rational intelligence, as well as of our responsibility to God altogether!—only get it, when we consent to reduce ourselves to a level with the unthinking clod of the valley, or the equally unthinking brick or stone which constitutes the pavement beneath our feet! Recoiling with abhorrence from such a soul-withering, God-dishonoring conclusion, we bid farewell for ever to the pretendedly infallible Church with her pretendedly infallible interpretations. And, in reference to any *true* Church of Christ, what do we say?—that its interpretations are infallible, because they are *its*? No such thing. They are only so, in so far as they exactly correspond with the analogy and proportion of faith in God's holy word. And as every true Church is built wholly on the foundation of the "Apostles and Prophets," Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone—and as it shines only by the light which it borrows and reflects from Jehovah's Holy Oracles,—to send us away from the Bible itself to the interpretations of any Church, is just to send us from the glorious sun to obtain fresh illumination from the pale moon, which has no light beyond what she borrows and reflects from the sun himself!

Being done with *THE CHURCH* we are next thrown upon *TRADITION*, for its oracular and infallible interpretations. Very well; in the free, open, and inquiring spirit of Protestantism, we ask, what is this *Tradition*, and where is it to be found? Here we are told that it is of two kinds, *written* and *unwritten* or *oral*. In *limine*, or at the outset, we feel disposed to ask, in a more legitimate form than the Caliph Omar;—Passing by literature and science altogether, which, being fairly within the grasp of the natural faculties, the Bible never proposes to supply, and coming to matters of *pure revelation*, moral and religious, does this supposed infallible Tradition of yours agree with the Bible or not? If it does, of what use is it?—Is it not a much simpler, and easier, and safer process to apply directly to the Bible itself? If it does *not*, it is and must be, on such subjects, worse than useless; because in that case, by being Anti-Biblical, it is indisputably Anti-Christian, and, therefore, not only not infallible but self-evidently false!—This alone would be amply sufficient to entitle us to reject the appeal to Tradition at once, as either wholly useless, or wholly worthless, or worse. But, lest it may be thought, that it is only an excuse for our ignorance—and that it is because we are wholly unacquainted, or but imperfectly conversant, with the nature of this transcendent entity, called "*Tradition*," it is well to take a glance at it, with the view of scanning its dimensions and detecting its peculiar qualities. Tradition, as we have learnt, is *two-fold*—*written* and *unwritten* or *oral*. Let us begin with the former. Where then, we ask, is *written* Tradition chiefly to be found? In the remains of the ancient or primitive Fathers of the Church. We have a sincere and profound regard for the sincerity, simplicity, and devotedness, and manifold services

of many of these Fathers. And if *too much* had not been arrogated on their behalf by superstition-ridden Papists and Puseyites, far would it be from the breast of any Protestant, to disturb their hallowed ashes. But, when monstrous pretensions are unwisely and irreverently set up on their behalf,—pretensions, which interfere with the exclusive supremacy of Christ and his inspired Apostles;—pretensions, moreover, which, if conceded, would crush for ever the right of private judgment—reduce the human mind to a condition of anile decrepitude—and burst open the flood-gates of error to deluge and lay waste a weary land;—it is time, high time, that every creature, endowed with reason and intelligence, should arise and ask, What credit is due to them as expounders of God's word, or whether their views of Divine Truth, or their interpretations of the Holy Scriptures are worthy of being regarded, in any way, as infallible? The theme was immense; but he (Dr. D.) dispaired not of rendering it briefly intelligible. Three charges he must bring against the Fathers, which must for ever annihilate not only all claims to the high prerogative of infallibility, but all claims to anything like superior deference or respect, as interpreters of sacred writ.

First.—As regards the meaning of particular passages, apart from any general system of interpretation, the Fathers constantly indulge in the most fantastic conceits, the most puerile follies, the most marvellous absurdities, and absolutely ineffable aberrations of reason and fancy. This alone would render them utterly unsafe as guides, because they are glaringly and self-evidently unsound as interpreters. Take one specimen from hundreds or thousands that might be adduced to illustrate this position. You know the passage in Cor. iii. 1, 2 “And I brethren could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able.” This passage becomes the subject of comment in one of the writings of Clement of Alexandria—one of the wisest and best and most celebrated of the Fathers. But, without consulting him, what is the meaning which every Sabbath scholar, and every intelligent Christian peasant in Great Britain would undoubtingly attach to it? Is it not this—that the Apostle upbraids the Corinthians with the little progress they had yet made in Divine knowledge or in the Divine life—that in consequence, they were more carnal than spiritual, yea little better than babes in Christ—that, on this account, he was still obliged to treat them as babes, that is, feed them with milk and not meat? In other words, from the low carnal state of their minds, and their little progress in spiritual knowledge, he was under the necessity of instructing them in the simplest and easiest and most elementary truths of the gospel, as they were unable to bear, unable to comprehend those higher and more sublime views of the gospel dispensation which are “meat” to them that are strongest in faith, and most advanced in experience of the spiritual life. Is not this the plain, simple, obvious, unmistakable import of the passage? But we must not circulate the Bible among people who, if left to themselves, are sure in this way to interpret it, if any wise thoughtful or candid! No! we must send along with this passage the different but infallible exposition of ancient Tradition as contained in one of the most justly esteemed of all the ancient Fathers. What then is his interpretation? Why, he is sadly puzzled and perplexed. How so? In his time, religious perfection began to consist very much in abstinence from certain meats and drinks, and in sundry other practices of asceticism. To abstain from meat, i. e. flesh meat, was an especial characteristic of the aspirant to perfection. It was this which confounded the worthy Father, Paul seems to speak of those whom he “fed with milk” as

"carnal," and those whom he could feed with "meat" (i. e. flesh,) as "spiritual." This is precisely the converse of the opinions and practices of the age of Clement. How is the contrary to be accounted for, or explained away? To assist him in this arduous attempt, he calls to his assistance a passage from John vi. 55—"My flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed." How then does he unravel the difficulty? Not by a simple exercise of his own common sense, but by a long disquisition on the physiological properties of "milk," "blood," and "meat" or "flesh," many parts of which are too loathsome to be rehearsed in "ears polite," but the main substance of which may be thus compendiously stated. What is milk? It is purified, filtered or spiritualized blood!—That is, blood which has been "spiritualized by contact with air in the arteries!—What again is meat or flesh? It is "solidified blood." But milk being only spiritualized blood, blood is of course only another form of milk. Now, as we have seen that flesh is only solidified blood, and blood only another form of milk, we may well pronounce flesh to be but solidified milk. And what can solidified milk be, but—*cheese*? By this happy and ingenious solution the joyous Father succeeds to his own satisfaction, in reconciling the apparent discrepancy between the Apostles' statement and the ascetic notions which were on the ascendant in his day! And such is a genuine specimen of the sort of infallible interpretations which the Romanist and the Puseyite would call upon us to disseminate, along with the Bible, from the written traditions of the Fathers!

Secondly.—Besides such glaring absurdities in the rendering of particular passages, there were many false modes, schemes, canons or systems of interpretation current among the Fathers, which extended to, affected, tinged, or vitiated the whole stream of revealed truth. One of these was the *amphibolia* or equivocation. Under the influence of this system it was held, that any word in any passage may have any one of the meanings which it any where else possesses in the language—wholly irrespective of the general sense of the passage itself, or connection, or context. This frightful latitudinarian principle they equally extended to the LXX. translation of the Old Testament, which they erringly held to be inspired. And thus any one word in the Old or New Testament might be made to possess any one of the meanings annexed to it throughout the whole vast extent of the overflowingly copious language of Greece—there being no let, nor limit, nor hindrance whatsoever beyond the whim, or caprice, or fancy, or ingenuity of the individual commentator! For instance, Solomon says—"Let thy words be few"—and a very simple and intelligible and excellent advice it is. But the term rendered "word" happens elsewhere in the Greek tongue to denote *technically* one particular kind of word in Grammar, viz. "*the verb*." So then, says one of the Fathers, in accordance with his scheme of amphibology, "let thy words be few" may mean, and in my opinion does here mean "let thy verbs be few." That is, the wise man is giving directions of a grammatical character, for the proper, and especially the spare use, of verbs! This is melancholy enough; but it is comparatively harmless. Surely, however, it needs no proof to shew that were such a baseless, changeable, Proteus-like principle to be generally applied, it would transform the Bible as completely as any of the fabled metamorphoses of poetry. From being a light to the feet and a lamp to the path, it would soon be converted into a labyrinth of darkness without a clue—from being the plainest of all books, which, be that man may read and understand too, as far as regards all great and essential truths, it would soon be turned into a chaotic mass of mythos, and riddles, and enigmas, and allegories. And this was the actual result. The obvious meanings, seen and read of all men, were

this process of mystified and mystifying research was openly defended by an unblushing reference to the practices of the Egyptian priests, whose hieroglyphics were designed to veil hidden wisdom—and the practices of the Grecian philosophers, as well as of all the heathen oracles and heathen mythologies since the world began. Following out the spirit of the system, each Father threw the various texts of Scripture into his own amphibological alembic, and there subjected them to sundry torturing processes, and thence pretended to extract their subtle essence or quintessence of mystical lore exhibiting the tinge and colour of the experimenter's own favourite notions and predominant prepossessions. And to these attenuated and unsubstantial and ever-changing essences we are referred, as embodying the infallible interpretations or written traditions of the Fathers!

Thirdly.—The gradual, and ultimately, the general introduction of the spirit and principles of the Grecian and Gnostic philosophies into the schemes of Biblical interpretation, tended still further to augment the confusion and detract from the authority of the Fathers as commentators on the word of God. This was pre-eminently true of the Platonic philosophy, first brought into unnatural alliance with Christianity by an otherwise amiable and estimable man, Justin Martyr. But after him Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement and others carried it to the extent of a perfect Plato-mania. Let one example suffice as a specimen. In Greece, the school of the Stoics advocated the doctrine of a stern, indomitable, uncontrollable fatalism; the Platonists, on the contrary, advocated the other extreme of self-regulating unlimited freedom of the will. This latter dogma was brought to bear on the system of Christian doctrine. And to such a climax was it carried that many of these infallible Fathers actually proclaimed that the will of man could, by a self-originating act, produce saving faith in the soul—could, by a self-originating act, accomplish its own election into the true Church and family of God—could, by a self-originating act, finally achieve its own salvation! And thus were two of the most fundamental articles of the Christian faith, viz. the utter worthlessness of man and his utter moral inability to save himself, together with the unconditional freeness and sovereignty of Divine grace in electing, calling, justifying and sanctifying the sinner, levelled in the dust! And on their ruins, was reared the towering fabric of self-righteousness, which, with all its pride-fostering accompaniments and grace-destroying consequences, eventually transmuted Christianity itself into the most gigantic of the multitudinous superstitutions of the earth! Plato preferred to Christ! The doctrines of his school preferred to the inspired teachings of the Apostles! The Scriptures quoted, only to be set aside, or explained away, or squared into some forced consistency with the philosophy of a heathen! And yet to these Platonizing Fathers, we are referred as the best, if not the infallible, expositors of Sacred Writ! Oh shame on those who would send us there! If we want to know the doctrines of Plato or of Aristotle, let us at once apply to them. But if, hungering and thirsting after righteousness, we seek among them for the peculiar and distinguishing doctrines of divine grace and a divinely conferred salvation, or for any full or veracious expositions of the same, we shall seek very much in vain. After experiencing “pangs without birth,” and exhibiting a fruitless industry, we shall have to come hungry and thirsty and empty away. Far from finding infallible interpretations, we are only doomed to stumble over some of the heaped heaps in the realms of nonsense, or at least of very unintelligible and worthless sense!

After all, the modern satires and eulogiums of the Fathers do show the greatest possible injustice. The earliest and the best of them, from Barnabas

downwards, lay no claim to infallibility; even on the score of recording instructions which may have been orally delivered by the Apostles, or those who associated with them. All their authoritative appeals, are to the written Scriptures. From these they attempt to justify, when necessary, their own avowed opinions—nothing having been orally delivered by the Apostles substantially additional or different from, far less contrary to, what has been recorded in the written Gospels and Epistles. Chrysostom, perhaps the most eloquent of all the Fathers, in his homilies, repeatedly declares that “all Christians ought to have recourse to the Scriptures—that, since heresy had infected the Churches, the divine Scriptures alone could afford a genuine proof of Christianity and a refuge to those who are desirous of arriving at the true faith—that there is no other method left to those who are willing to discover the true Church of Christ; but by the Scriptures alone—that it is absurd while we will not trust other people in pecuniary affairs, but choose to reckon and calculate for ourselves, that in matters of far greater consequence, we should implicitly follow the opinions of others, especially as we possess the most exact and perfect rule and standard by which to regulate our several inquiries, viz. the regulations of the Divine laws—that, therefore, he could wish that all would neglect what this or that man asserts for truth, and investigate all these things in the Scriptures.” From all this it cannot be doubted that the wisest and the best of the Fathers would be the first to disclaim the honour that has been so indiscreetly thrust upon them—would be the first to repudiate the possession of the alleged attribute of infallibility—would be the first to renounce such high pretensions as presumptuous towards their fellow-men, and blasphemous towards God! Away then for ever with the preposterous dogma of the infallibility of their interpretations or written traditions!

If written tradition cannot be trusted as a safe, and least of all, as an infallible interpreter of Sacred Scripture, infinitely less can oral Tradition be trusted. Indeed its claims and pretension to be accounted a guide at all to the sense of Holy writ and the mind of God's spirit revealed therein are a plain outrage even on the ridiculous. “By their fruits ye shall know them,” is a divine maxim of universal applicability. Let us apply it as a test or touchstone to the subject of oral Tradition. What “fruits,” then, has this Tradition ever borne to entitle it to be exalted to the seat of infallible authority? By means of its interpretations, it enabled the Pharisees of old to “make void the Law of Moses”—to evacuate the Prophets of all their spiritual significance—to gain for themselves an absolute ascendancy over an ignorant formalistic people—to exasperate the popular mind against the Lord of Life, who was the very Messiah promised to the Fathers—to stimulate to the final rejection of “the Wonderful, the Counsellor, the Prince of Peace”—and in the cross of Calvary to rear a monument to its genuine character and triumphs which might appal and alarm the whole universe of God! In later ages, oral Tradition has witnessed the consummation of its labours in the erection of the most hideous edifice which the world has ever seen—the lying, apostate, idolatrous, and blasphemous Church of Rome. Is proof wanted? The history of fifteen hundred years is one continued and uninterrupted proof. The infallible interpretations of oral Tradition! Indeed! What says authentic History? Look at the undisputed and indisputable facts of the case, and do not allow yourselves to be beguiled and be gulled by high sounding and vainglorious pretensions. Looking at the established records of History, what do we really find? There, we find that oral Tradition has so interpreted Scripture as to deface the simplicity of Christian worship, which ought ever to be “in spirit and in truth,” by the introduction of a prodigious assortment of bells, candles, vestments of

variegated hues out-rivalling the colours of the rainbow or the gaudy glitter of the peacock's tail—and the multiplication of rites and ceremonies, which in grotesque variety and meaningless absurdity vastly exceed all the rituals of ancient and modern Paganism put together!—And this is the Tradition to which we are referred as an infallible interpreter of God's word! Again, oral Tradition has so interpreted Scripture as to have successively *perverted, falsified, or neutralized* every leading and peculiar doctrine of Revelation, connected with man's lapsed and sinful estate by nature, his justification through faith alone without any works of merit of his own, and his sanctification by the grace of the Holy Spirit independent of the pretended efficacy of ritualistic forms. And to these *corruptions* it has added sundry new and strange doctrines of Demons, of Purgatory, of subordinate Mediators, of the worship of Saints, the adoration of Angels, the homage to the Virgin Mary—so that were the holy Apostles to arise from their grave they could no longer recognize the “natural likeness” of the truths which themselves had taught,—so completely hid, or distorted, or exaggerated have their features become under the vizard of that masquerading harlequin—oral Tradition!—And yet, this is the authority to which we are referred for its infallible interpretations! Farther still; oral Tradition has so interpreted Scripture as to have manufactured and added five Sacramental Ordinances of its own to the only two that were ever instituted by the great Head of the Christian Church or his Holy Apostles. And even on these two it has looked with its Medusa-like head; and from being beautifully symbolical, significant, commemorative, sealing ordinances, refreshing to the eye of faith and exhilarating to the renovated spirit, it has transformed them into pieces of dead, senseless materialism, endowed with certain intrinsic virtues or qualities that operate magically in conferring spiritual graces and gifts, somewhat after the manner of spells or charms, or talismans, or witching incantations. As if the adorers of Tradition or Ecclesiastical Alchemists were bent on out-stripping their cotemporaries of “Elixir” and “Philosopher's stone” celebrity—the Physical Alchemists of the dark ages—who pretended also to the most wondrous discoveries, such as a peculiar preparation of agate which had the singular virtue of rendering the dullest and most stupid at once eloquent and witty—a peculiar preparation of laurel-leaf which, being placed in a particular position on the crown of the head, had the uncommon virtue of immensely fortifying the memory—a peculiar preparation of the brains of birds, and especially birds of swift wing, which had the rare virtue of marvellously exciting and expanding the imaginative faculties! And such is the Tradition to which we are referred for infallible interpretations of Jehovah's Holy Oracles! Once more, oral Tradition has so interpreted and illustrated scripture in regard to the lives of worthies of the olden time, whose faith and other graces and labours of love and godly devotedness have been recorded by the pen of inspiration as to obscure, eclipse, or wholly efface the great moral and spiritual lessons thereby conveyed—and instead thereof, has handed down to us a goodly consignment of physical or fossilized remains of their persons or objects associated with their memory. Hence the teeming brood and rabble-rout of venerable relics for the amusement of the credulous, the admiration of the ignorantly devout, and the scorn and contempt of all sober and right-thinking men. Wonder-working relics indeed! The bones of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—the stone on which the father of the faithful offered his only son—chips of the brazen serpent—and specimens of the manna in the wilderness and the blossoms of Aaron's rod! Descending to Gospel times, we have the axe, saw, and hammer of Joseph the espoused husband of Mary—a piece of

discarded as sought; while the constant search was for the hidden, obscure, reconciling meanings supposed to lie concealed far beneath the surface. And the camel's hair garment of John the Baptist, and of the linen on which he was beheaded, and the forefinger wanting the nail, the identical forefinger with which he pointed to the blessed Saviour, saying "Behold the Lamb of God"—a piece of St. Peter's staff and chain, his sword somewhat rusty, the stone on which his cock crew, and rags of the sail of his boat when a fisherman in the lake of Galilee—part of the Virgin Mary's hair, veil and girdle, one of her combs and shoes, her holy spousal ring, and considerable quantities of her milk! And of other Apostles, and Prophets, and holy Martyrs, we have endless and countless fragments and memorials in the diversified forms of hair and heads and skulls, tongues and teeth and beards, jaw-bones and shoulder blades, ribs and livers and hearts, legs and toes and slippers, yea and portions of the very breath of some carefully enclosed by angels in stoppered phials! But we must pause. One does not know whether to smile or weep:—whether to smile at the inevitable foolery of all this—or to weep at the burning dishonour thereby reflected on the God of Heaven and the ruinous delusions practised on the souls of men. We are challenged to ask Tradition to interpret unto us the lives and actions and characters of Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs of Jesus, and to expound unto us the lessons which we are thence to learn for our own guidance and direction. And while we are waiting for the response of this infallible oracle, it only points us to a museum of antiquarian and unheard of physical curiosities—wonder-working relics—which are said to perform greater miracles than the living servants of God, of whom they are the pretended remnants or memorials! What is this but the crudest of mockery—the bitterest of derision? Wonder, oh heavens! and be astonished, oh earth!—at the forbearance and long-suffering patience of the Lord! We ask for truth—unerring truth—and we are sent to oral Tradition, the prolific mother of lies. We ask for verdure, and are sent to the blasted heath. We ask for water from the crystal fount, and are sent to the stagnant marsh. We ask for bread from the King's store-house, and are turned adrift to feed on thorns and thistles. We ask for light, and are sent down to the dingy caverns and coal pits of the earth. We ask for life, and are sent to the mouldering bones and ashes of the sepulchre!

Seeing then the absolute impossibility of obtaining any thing like infallible interpretations from that undefined and undefinable phantasm which Romanists and Puseyites denominate *THE CHURCH*—and the equal impossibility of extracting any thing like an infallible, or even decently fallible, interpretation from that other enormous bugbear designated *TRADITION*, whether written or oral—let us return to where we started, and that is, to the word of God itself, as expressly designed and adapted by its Omnipotent infallible Author to the understandings and hearts of the children of men. We too say that, notwithstanding the divine adaptation between the written word and the human spirit, it does stand in need of an authoritative Agent, who can infallibly interpret, illumine, and enforce. And who is this great and glorious Agent? Not any of the ghostly apparitions of *Church* or *Tradition*, but the Omnipotent Spirit of all grace. He is the infallible interpreter, the infallible illuminator, the infallible enforcer of that blessed word which He Himself once dictated. To Him then—and to Him alone—we send or commend such darkened soul when we part with a copy of the word of life. There is a flinty rock, and beside it lies a potent hammer. Between these there is a mutual adaptation. There is a fitness in the hammer to break, there is a susceptibility in the rock to be broken.

But, *there*, they will lie to all eternity, still and motionless, incapable of influencing or of being influenced, unless some other power interpose. Let that be the brawny arm of an athletic man. Wielded thereby the hammer smites, and each stroke is followed by a chasm or a rent. See the word of God and the heart of man! The former is the hammer; the latter is the flinty rock. These may lie together for ever in a sort of mechanical juxtaposition, without affecting or being affected—the one by the other—unless some mightier power than Church, or Tradition, or the collective capabilities of all men and angels, intervene. But let the word be once wielded by the Omnipotent Spirit of God, and speedily will it be followed by rents and chasms in the flinty rock of the human heart—yea, soon will the whole heart be broken to pieces—aye, and melted into contrition, too, before the Lord—the God of Israel—and the Rock of our Salvation! *There*, is good seed and a good soil—mutually fitted and adapted to each other. But there is no life, no germination, no growth, no foliage, no fruit there, until the rain of heaven water it, and the sunshine of heaven warm and animate it. So the word of God and the soil of an honest heart! But there is no life—no symptom of spiritual vitality or fruitfulness there—till it is visited by the dew of Divine grace and vivified by the quickening influences of the Holy Spirit. Let, however, great drops once begin to fall from heaven on the dry and parched soil of the human heart—at once the precursor and the earnest of the coming shower or copious affusion of the Holy Spirit's life-imparting grace—and speedily will the indestructible seed of the word take root, and fructify—springing upwards, and shooting outwards—putting forth buds of verdure, and blossoms of promise—and eventually bearing golden fruit for immortality.

Behold, then, the high and holy vocation of the active members and agents of this Association. With the Bible in their hands and the love of the Bible in their hearts, they go forth amongst spiritually diseased and dying men. They go forth in humble dependence on the presence and aid of the Holy Spirit, without whose grace nothing truly wise, holy, or good in the sight of God can ever be accomplished. They go forth knocking at every door, and addressing every individual who is ready to lend an ear to their message of mercy. With the living voice they endeavour to arrest attention, to excite the spirit of inquiry, to awaken concern for the interests of the immortal soul. They speak of sin and the great salvation; and they tell that great though the sins of men may be, there is a still greater Saviour. They point to "the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world;" and they tell that the Bible is that which testifieth of Him. They proclaim man's natural blindness, and inability to see; his natural hardness of heart, and inability to feel; his natural undone and lost estate, and moral inability to save himself;—and they tell that it is the Spirit of God alone who, taking of the things of Christ and applying them to the soul, can savingly enlighten, savingly soften, and savingly deliver. They declare that the word of God which is truth, is the grand instrument in the hands of the Holy Spirit, for convincing and converting sinners; and they point to the Bible as the exclusive repository of that word. And when they find individuals both able and willing, candidly and honestly to pursue that word, they give copies of the Bible, in whole or in part, accompanied with many earnest counsels, and many kindly invitations and persuasions to apply to God's own believing people, and above all to God Himself, for further assistance in the study of the sacred volume. They then part, commending them to God and His Heavenly grace—sending up the fervent prayer that He, by His Spirit, may open their eyes, in the full assurance that then they should "behold wondrous things in His Holy Law."

Let this Association, therefore, persevere in its noble and God-like calling. And let its measures and plans and modes of operation be perfected more and more. In being so intimately associated with the Bible, they were linked with the cause of Eternal Truth—with that word of the living God which endureth for ever. That word had already survived the corruptions of the age of giant wickedness that succeeded the fall. That word had carried the Patriarch Noah in safety across the cataclysm of a universal deluge. That word, in Judah's land and Salem's tabernacles, had out-lived the degeneracy of God's own people, and the incessant aggression of the surrounding idolatries of the nations. And when it was thought that on Mount Calvary it had been extinguished for ever, thence it sprung forth with renovated energy, subduing every antagonist principle, and establishing itself in direct opposition to all the powers of earth, aided though these were by all the powers of darkness. During the middle ages it survived the freezing midnight gloom, that eclipsed the visible Church, and well nigh benumbed into perpetual congelation the human faculties. And at the glorious Reformation it burst forth afresh in all the effulgence of its pristine lustre. Thus, had the word of God already survived the shock of many changes and catastrophes, which had overturned once potent dynasties, and scattered to the four winds of heaven the proudest memorials of human glory and the stateliest monuments of human power. And it would still survive the shakings of the nations, outbrave the devouring ravages of time, outlive the corruptions of human depravity, and flourish and triumph when the Shaster of the Brahman, the Koran of the Mussulman, the lying legends of the Papist, and the truth-perverting Traditions of the Puseyite were consigned, in undistinguishing dishonour, to a common grave, with no one from pole to pole to act the part of chief mourner at the funeral;—yea, and it would still continue to flourish and triumph when all the Kingdoms of this world, and all the lordly hierarchies of idolatry and superstition, with all their pomp and pageantry, would be for ever swallowed up and lost, amid the over-powering glories of Messiah's reign!

THE

COLPORTEURS

OR

BIBLE DISTRIBUTORS OF FRANCE;

THEIR

CHARACTER, LABOURS, AND SUCCESS.

[REPRINTED FROM THE CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN OBSERVER FOR DECEMBER 1841.]

How diversified the agencies employed by an overruling Providence for disseminating the seeds of vegetable life throughout the world! Of these the chiefest is the agency of human beings, subjected to varied wants, but endowed with contriving intelligence to provide for them. Among human beings, again, the *regular* and *established order*, in conducting the great process of dissemination, is that of the *husbandman*. From his soil-preparing, seed-dispersing labours, the surface of earth is periodically clothed with vegetation and fruitage—fit to minister to the necessities and comforts of its teeming inhabitants. But the mantle of verdure that enshrouds the earth is not, instrumentally, the product of human beings alone; still less, of the peculiar class or genus of husbandmen. The Sovereign Proprietor of nature disdains not the employment of other agencies—however humble or subordinate. The beasts of the field are often made the vehicles of living seeds, which, dropping as they graze, take root and germinate—replenishing the pastures with new produce and the soil with an increase of fatness. The birds of the air, ploughing the liquid firmament, become winged vessels for transporting vital germs to the recesses of solitary dells, and to the clefts and crevices of rugged mountains. The winds of heaven plentifully scatter, as with ten thousand arms, the downy atoms whose after-blossoming adorns the lawn, or beautifies the meadow. Rivulets and streams are the conductors of rudimental particles of life, whose subsequent budding fertilises the barren shore, or clothes with verdure the newly-formed alluvial or coral islands. Boast not then, O man, constituted though thou be, lord of

this lower creation :—still less, boast not, O husbandman, appointed though thou be as the chief agent of distribution ;—boast not of an *exclusive* prerogative in thy appointment—an *exclusive* monopoly in thy vocation. Behold, and be not ashamed of thy co-adjutors and co-rivals in the vast field of this world's husbandry ! Behold them anew, and drop thy presumptuous arrogance. For, whether you own them or not, it is nevertheless true that some of the richest pasturage of the valley, the most brilliant hues of the meadow, the stateliest forests of the mountain, the most luxuriant herbage of ocean's islands are the separate or conjoint products of beasts of the field and birds of the air, the winds of heaven and the waters of running streams !

And is not the God of grace one and the same with the God of Providence ? Then, ought not the *analogy* that pervades all his works,—whether of creation, of providence, or of grace,—to lead us to anticipate the *sanction* of a *similar variety* in the *modes* of disseminating the *seed of spiritual life*—the seminal principle of the new birth of the soul—the incorruptible word which liveth and abideth for ever ? The Divine Depository—Seeds-man—Sower—of this enduring word is the Son of God himself. But, when about to ascend up on high, leading captivity captive, he formally delegated to his body, the Church, the sublime administrative function of sowing the precious seed every where, throughout the vast field of the world. In this Church—this collective body of the faithful or true believers in every country and age,—the principal agents for fulfilling the divine commission, doubtless, were, primarily apostles, and secondarily men endowed with the apostolic spirit, though not with the miraculous apostolic gifts, and consecrated to the holy office of the Christian ministry. But though these have been, and are, the *chief*, they are by no means, the *sole* agents. No ;—*every true and faithful disciple*—whether lay or clerical, ordained or unordained, literate or illiterate—is solemnly bound, in his sphere and circumstances, and according to his talents and opportunities—bound, by his precepts and example, his walk and conversation, to be a distributor of the word of life. And thus, in point of fact, it has been in ages past. Men of science and literature have caused the word of God to make invasion of the loftiest citadels of human intellect. Poets, under the inspiration of song, have wafted it on the wings of imagination to the remotest solitudes of head and heart. Artizans and peasants have conveyed it into the hamlets of their humble neighbours ; and voices of sweetest melody have thence resounded to the honour of Jehovah, Lord of Hosts. Women have been honoured and pow-

erful fellow-helpers in advancing Christ's kingdom and cause. Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings has God often rebuked unbelief, and perfected his own praise. And from the teaching of obscure pilgrims, and the dying testimonies of untitled martyrs, has *the word* often gushed forth in living streams, to fertilize the moral wildernesses of earth and the barren isles of ocean. Nor has the work of dissemination been limited to the immediate personal labours and oral deliverances of human beings. Epistles and apologies, discourses and comments have embodied much of the spirit and substance of the sacred oracles; and dispersed them, in abridged or concentrated forms, through more than half the nations. Above all, has the written or printed word of God itself, in whole or in part, through innumerable and often non-descript agencies, found its way with effect into the palaces of kings, the cottages of the poor, and the kraals of the savage.

Be silenced, then, ye vain and proud boasters, whosoever ye are, that pretend to an *exclusive* prerogative, either as regards the *possession* or the *distribution* of that blessed word, which is designed of heaven to be the light and the life of a benighted and a famishing world! Behold, and hail your co-adjutors and co-rivals—however humble and inferior—in the mighty work of instrumentally enlightening and vivifying the nations! Scorn not such alliance; disdain not such auxiliaries;—lest ye be found fighting against God, and involving yourselves in greater impiety far than that of Balak, the prophet who coveted the wages of unrighteousness. Even he, in taking up his parable, felt constrained to cry out, “How shall I curse, whom God hath not cursed? or how shall I defy, whom the Lord hath not defied?” And who are ye, oh proud pretenders to all that is apostolic—save their gifts and graces, their unction of piety, fervour of devotedness, and burning memorials of self-denial—who are ye, that ye should dare to anathematise, whom God hath not anathematized? or defy, whom the Lord hath not defied? or reject, whom Jehovah hath not rejected, as co-workers with Himself in extending the bounds of the Redeemer's kingdom? Away, then, away with the whole rubbish of human devices about *exclusively authorized* and *positively unauthorized* or *prohibited* agents, in the free field and royal domain of the everlasting gospel—a field and domain into which *whosoever* entereth by faith is at once redeemed, and becometh a *king and priest* unto his God and Father for evermore! That man truly is *authorized*, who, with a spiritually enlightened mind and a believing heart, is prompted by the love of Christ and compassion for lost souls, to declare or expound the word of God,—to sow or

distribute the seed of life—in any quarter, and to any portion of a perishing world. That man truly is *unauthorized*, who, with an understanding not yet spiritually illumined, and a heart not yet spiritually converted, chooses to *assume* to himself a share in this great work ;—even though he were to be dedicated thereto, by the laying on of the hands of all the Cardinals, Patriarchs, and Popes—all the Bishops and Arch-bishops—of Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australia !

Such has been the train of reflection suddenly awakened in our mind by the perusal of certain parts of the last report of the British and Foreign Bible Society. We allude more particularly to the plans and proceedings of M. De Pressensé, the Society's agent in France. As the peculiar nature and character of that gentleman's operations seem to be little known ; and as from their magnitude and success they promise to constitute a new era of Protestant philanthropy in Western Europe, as well as encourage to the trying of similar experiments elsewhere,—we conclude that a better service cannot be rendered to the cause of Bible distribution than to epitomize an account from his own voluminous statements to the parent Society during the last four years.

Since the appointment of M. De Pressensé, eight years ago, as principal agent of the society in France, the amount of Bible distribution in that country has been nearly *trebled*. This increase has not been made *per saltum*. It has been the result of a steady and regular progression ; as will at once appear from the following tabular representation :—

From 1st April 1833 to 1st April 1834	Total distribution	55,626
1834	1835	62,194
1835	1836	80,921
1836	1837	88,147
1837	1838	120,654
1838	1839	121,412
1839	1840	137,092
1840	1841	149,413

It must not be supposed, however, that these immense aggregates represent copies of the *entire* Bible. No ;—but they do represent either *whole* copies of the *entire* Bible, including Old and New Testaments, or *whole* copies of the *entire* New Testament—with *no* copies of *separate* portions of either, except a *few* of the *Psalms of David*. The *proportion* of entire Bibles to New Testaments is very nearly *as one to ten* ; and of the *Psalms* to either, a very small fraction indeed. A fair *average* view of the numbers of these, respectively disposed of, may be found in the distribution of the

last year, which is as follows :—Bibles, 14,544 ; New Testaments, 134,616 ; Psalms, 253. Neither must it be supposed that these are given away *gratuitously*. No such thing. The proportion of copies *annually* parted with as *free gifts*, or *grants*, has scarcely ever exceeded *one in fifty* ; *often*, not *one in a hundred* ; and sometimes, not *more than one in two hundred*. The probable average of many years may be taken at about *one in eighty*. *All the rest* have been disposed of in a way to ensure, for the most part, a good use being made of them, inasmuch as they have been *sold, purchased, and paid for, at a fair remunerating price*.

Glancing at the above table, it must at once appear that the *first remarkable stride* in the way of *sudden increase*, took place in the year 1837-38. And that the increase did not arise from any *temporary* exigency of immanent pressure,—or the violent impulse of an *ephemeral* excitement,—or the *fleeting* transit of some new cause of prodigious momentum, not to be counted on within the range of *ordinary* instrumentalities,—must be self-evident from the fact, that not only has there since been *no reaction*, but, on the contrary, a *stedfast and advancing process of augmentation*. Now the grand practical question is, *What is the true source and origin—what the real explanatory cause of this novel and delightful phenomenon ?* The true source and origin, as well as the sufficiently explanatory cause of the whole, may be found in *the fact*, that the said year of sudden increase was the first on which the Parisian agent of the Society enlisted a *new and peculiar agency* in the great cause of Bible distribution—an agency, by means of which the first great increase was entirely effected—an agency, by whose indefatigable and successful services, that increase has not only been ever since maintained, but rendered steadily progressive. *What, then, it may be asked, what is this new and peculiar yet powerful agency ?* The agency is none other than that of the humble class of individuals, technically known under the designation of COLPORTEURS, or CARRIERS. But they are *Bible-Carriers*, that is, *Bearers of precious seed* ;—and who can tell, how much nobler a share they may be privileged to have in preparing the harvest and reaping the crowns of immortality, than numbers of mitred heads that are clothed in purple, live in palaces, and fare sumptuously every day ? To supply a brief, condensed account, therefore, of the origin, character, labours, trials, and success of this humble, useful, and devoted class of fellow-workers in the gospel vineyard, we now cheerfully proceed. In doing so, the very words of M. De Pressensé himself, will often be used.

1.—*The origin and object of the class of Colporteurs.*

In a country like France, where every thing connected with religion had fallen into complete discredit, and where the conduct of too many of the clergy had cast a general, though often unjust slur, upon all who exercised the functions of the Christian ministry, it seemed almost indispensable that other agents should be employed besides the ordained ministers of the gospel, who were from the very name of their office, subjected to many unfavourable prejudices; and who, moreover, might have given a colouring of *controversial Protestantism* to a work which ought to be essentially Catholic, in the true and proper acceptation of that term. Under these peculiar circumstances, it pleased God, who is ever rich in means as in mercy, and who has so often "chosen the weak things of the world to confound the mighty," to raise up at once distributors of the Bible, who, from their humble rank in society, might afford less cause for apprehension on the part of the Romish priests at the commencement of their work, when it was necessary, for ensuring its fuller development, that it should not be guineayed; and who, in consequence of their station in life, might be eminently useful, when, by occasion of displaying their acquaintance with the Bible, they would be able to prove to all that the truths of salvation, so profound in their nature, are nevertheless comprehended and believed by the simplest of souls, who sincerely and cordially receive them with earnest prayer for the assistance of the Spirit of God. To this new and peculiar class of distributors of the Holy Scriptures was applied the distinctive appellation of *Colporteurs*. But when did they first arise?—Only very little beyond twenty years ago. It was about that time, that the first dissemination of the Bible was attempted in France by a very small number of persons in some of the villages of the department of the Nord; and towards the centre of the country, in the district known under the name of La Beauce. The parties who made these attempts received at first the greatest encouragement, although they everywhere met with the most inconceivable religious ignorance. The Bible and New Testament were literally as much unknown as they possibly could be in the most remote savage country. Occasionally, a few words respecting certain events mentioned in the Holy Scriptures had been heard to escape the lips of the parish minister, and scanty fragments of the gospel were to be met with in the breviary, but never before had they heard the name of that volume which contains the whole system of revealed truth. The success of the first *Colporteurs*, or distributors of the Bible, excited a holy emulation among the remnant of the true servants of the Lord in France. Nor was it long before active proceedings were adopted among the truly reformed Protestant churches, under the superintendence of genuine ministers of Christ, for the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures. A seal for the Bible cause was thus gradually called into existence; and its true friends, no longer satisfied with a Bible Society for Protestants only, eventually agreed to form a National Institution, and to extend its operations to all the inhabitants of the country without distinction. In reliance on the Almighty, they commenced their labours; and, in a very short space of time, the French and Foreign Bible Society has shown itself as a tree full of vigour, with branches widely extending around. At the same time, a large number of associations, of more or less importance, sprang up on different sides, who either attached themselves to the new institution, or acted independently of it; and it is gratifying to state, that even many old Roman Catholics have rallied round it as the brethren of awakened Protestants. In order farther to give a system-

atic direction to all these exertions, Evangelical Societies were formed, not only in France, but also in other countries, and the work of Evangelization has assumed a considerable degree of extension and activity. Now it was by these various French Protestant Churches, Bible and Evangelical Societies, that the work of *Bible Colportage* was *exclusively* carried on, during the first twenty years of that new system. Throughout that period, the British and Foreign Bible Society effectively assisted the French churches and associations, by supplying Bibles at prime cost or reduced prices to enable them to carry on their indigenous scheme of *Colportage* and other evangelizing labours; but, till within the last four years, it had no *Colporteurs* of its own, or *directly in its own pay*. But when twenty years had demonstrated the *adaptation* and *efficiency* of the *Colportage* system of distributing copies of the word of God, it could no longer hesitate to attempt the same plan directly on its own account;—more especially when it could command the services of a man of such talent, wisdom, and enthusiasm as M. De Pressensé.

2.—*Their temporal condition, character and qualifications, zeal and disinterestedness.*

When, in the autumn of 1837, M. De Pressensé first obtained the sanction of the parent society to engage directly in the system of *Colportage*, his first care was to summon together such as were *real friends* of the Bible to take a share in the projected labour. After the calls made for this purpose to a very small number of churches only, more than one *hundred* Christian brethren offered themselves as candidates for the honour. A proof this, of the great progress which *vital* religion had made in many parts of France; inasmuch as twenty years earlier it would have been a matter of the greatest difficulty to find even a dozen Bible distributors, truly qualified as such, in all the French churches. Of those who presented themselves, *one-half* had formerly belonged to the Roman Catholic church—though, out of the entire number who earnestly competed for the privilege, only forty-four, from want of pecuniary means, could be engaged. This number has been gradually increased. Last year it amounted to *one hundred and five*, of whom not fewer than *eighty-seven* had once been Roman Catholics.

As to *temporal condition*, they are all of the humble class of *peasants* and *artizans*. Having their own separate professions on which they mainly depend for a livelihood, the greater part of them only give a portion of their time to the task of Bible distribution; some for six, others four, and again, others only three months; or, in other words, the time which they could spare from their usual vocations, without altogether abandoning them. In thus employing them, it is remarked, that the advantages are,—first, that while they are carrying on for themselves a business which ensures their livelihood, there is a certain degree of assurance that they do not perform the work of *Colportage* solely as a profitable calling for their temporal interests;—and secondly, that the Society is not obliged to incur the heavy charge of keeping them beyond the season which is favourable for the operations of the *Colporteurs*.

As to *character and qualifications*, they are and must be those of *heart-believers*,—*heart-Christians*. The gifts of a superior education, the attainments of learned scholarship, they neither have nor are expected to possess. But it is expected, you and insisted on, that reasonable proofs should be afforded of their having been made experimentally to know for themselves that true and infallible theology, which is communicated by the light of the Holy Spirit to every soul that has received the Bible in sincerity as the word of God himself. Accordingly, whatever others

himself as a Colporteur of the Holy Scriptures is seriously requested to examine himself before the Lord, and solemnly to ask himself, as in the presence of Him who cannot be deceived, if he feels himself truly called by the Lord to this sacred office; and if the Holy Spirit bears witness to his spirit, that he engages in the work not merely by way of exercising a profession, but with a view to labour under the blessing of the Almighty for the dissemination of the Bible, which is the word of God, to be known, believed, loved, and practised by all who wish to be saved. Knowledge of God's word, faith and prayer, meekness and patience, a desire for God's glory and compassion for the souls of men;—these, and these alone, are the qualifications which are demanded, or held to be indispensable in a *duly qualified Colporteur*.

As to *devoted zeal and disinterestedness*, these appear in many ways. First, in making their applications, they usually enter into *reasons*, of which the following are a few samples:—"After having," writes one, "scrupulously read and examined your instructions, and maturely reflected on the obligations which they prescribe, I recognise with great joy that I feel an attraction quite peculiar for the calling of a Colporteur. I am, therefore, ardently desirous of being engaged as one, not only for the sale of the Sacred Scriptures, but also for speaking to and for instructing, by help from above, the crowds of countrymen who are plunged in ignorance, by putting the Gospel in their hands, and explaining to them, as well as it may be given to me, what that precious book contains. I trust, with the blessing of God, in whom I place all my hope, that the resolution which I this day take before him, may not be in vain, but may contribute to his glory and to the advancement of his kingdom." "I was," writes a second, in offering his services, "a Roman Catholic whom God has brought out of the darkness of papacy, and has enlightened by the truth as it is in Jesus. I am, therefore, very desirous of being useful amongst those of my former religious persuasion, and for this purpose of putting into their hands the word of life. I have prayed the Lord to banish this desire from my heart, if it be not his will to employ me; but I still continue disposed to carry the Gospel to those who have it not. I am, however, aware that there are many difficulties to be encountered from the world, but the Lord is sufficiently powerful to defend his children in time of need." In expressing his desires and resolutions, a third candidate, formerly a Roman Catholic, writes—"I depend upon the promises of that gracious Saviour who has said to his disciples, 'I will not leave you. I will be with you always.' It is under the protection of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, that I am anxious to labour in disseminating his holy word, which alone is able to lead us to eternal happiness. With these sentiments I desire to dedicate myself to the work of vending the Sacred Scriptures. At the same time, I have not concealed from myself that this calling is sometimes attended with difficulties, and that moments will occur when the contempt and scorn of infidels will be hard to be borne; but I know that he who is sustained by the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, is enabled to triumph over every difficulty, and will be endowed with the needful perseverance, patience, and Christian forbearance. In this persuasion and trusting solely to the Lord, I do not hesitate to offer myself to you as a Bible Colporteur."

The arduousness of the enterprize, hinted at in these extracts, certainly does, in the absence of any equivalent earthly recompense, set an authenticating seal to the antecedent credibility of the devotedness of these humble labourers. It is only in winter, and even during the worst part of that rigorous season, when the country people, although accustomed to the inclemency of the weather, are obliged to seek shelter

within their houses, that the Colporteurs are able to carry on their labours under favourable circumstances. Then it is, accordingly, that they are seen to quit the bosoms of their own families, bearing on their shoulders an assortment of the Scriptures as heavy as their strength will permit; and proceeding through remote bye-paths, often rendered nearly impassable, towards some little isolated village, where they have the expectation of disposing of a copy of the word of God. In these various pilgrimages, they have often no other shelter than a stable or a barn, and only black bread or the coarsest provisions for their fare. Frequently, too, have they to encounter what is usually most difficult to bear, the sarcasms and railings, the contumely and scorn, of the very people whom they strive to benefit. Why, then, do they brave such hardships and fatigue, such insult and cruel reproach? Is it the hope of being handsomely rewarded by men? No. They are amply satisfied with the scantiest allowance that is barely sufficient for the most moderate expenses of living and keep. But scanty and limited though the allowance be, the cases of several are quoted, who,—when unable to resist the strong inclination which they felt to supply the *destitute poor* in different places with a Bible or New Testament *gratis*, in consequence of their being utterly unable to contribute even a few *sous* towards the purchase,—requested the chief agent to charge their account with the full value of the copies so distributed. Now, on the known principles of human nature, how is all this to be accounted for, except on the intelligible supposition that the men are truly, what they profess to be, actuated by *disinterested zeal* for the glory of God and the spiritual welfare of the souls of men? And what is it all but a practical and emphatic comment on the self-sacrificing energy that can be exhibited by the men of any class or condition that attain, through grace, to that state and frame of mind, so significantly alluded to, in some of the preceding extracts? Oh, yes.—Let the unbelieving world flout and scorn as it will, it is clear beyond debate that we have here before us a class of men who know experimentally that noble principle of action—‘I believe, and *therefore* have I spoken’—men, who, have embraced the truths of the Gospel with so lively a faith, and so ardent a love, that they feel themselves powerfully called upon to assist in disseminating that sacred volume, by which they themselves had been delivered from the blindness of ignorance and the bonds of error, and from which they have obtained that saving knowledge and those clear convictions which constitute all their own happiness and soul-satisfying reward.

Or if, by possibility, any filmy doubts could still hover around the subject, surely the very shadow of departing scepticism would be rebuked away by the perusal of the journals of these devoted labourers. There, the heavenward breathings of the soul find articulate expression, in forms that are pervaded with *internal evidence* of sincerity, and animated with the very spirit of devoutest piety. ‘Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it;’ writes one of these Colporteurs. ‘It is in vain for us to rise up early and sit up late,’ except the Lord bestow His blessing upon our work; for our labour is in vain. And here on our knees we humbly implore Him to vouchsafe His blessing to the 2490 copies of His holy word, which we have circulated this year. Alas poor Brittany! we have examined thee on all sides and found only ruin and desolation within thy borders. Thou hast shepherds, who, instead of conducting thee into green pastures by the side of the peaceful waters of the Gospel, only lead thee to muddy streams, and to broken cisterns that hold no water;—and such has been thy state for a number of centuries. But lift up thy head and look around, for the day is perhaps not far distant when the Sun of Righteousness shall arise upon thee, bringing

life and salvation in his beams! Would to God that it were so already, and that the seed which he has permitted us by His grace to cast upon the ground of Brittany may not have fallen by the way-side, or upon a rock, or among thorns, but on good ground where it may bring forth fruit a hundred-fold! We have this month, had to perform long and harassing journeys; but all our troubles are forgotten in the gratifying recollection that we have sold 232 New Testaments in schools which were before entirely destitute of them. Yes, we have indeed great reason to thank the Lord for the health and strength which He has granted to us amidst all our fatigues! Oh, may He condescend to bear with our manifold infirmities, or rather may He deliver us from them, and grant us the unspeakable blessing of serving Him faithfully to the end of our lives!

The modes of procedure prescribed to, and actually pursued by, the Colporteurs.

On the principal agent in Paris, M. De Pressensac, devolves the duty of selecting, testing, and superintending all the inferior agents. He it is who plans every campaign for the peaceful invasion of different parts of the kingdom of darkness. From him emanate all directions to his subordinates respecting the manner of conducting their monthly journals, the mode of keeping their accounts; and every thing connected with carrying on their operations with method and regularity. The routes are arranged as follows:—In France, the Departments (Counties) are divided into arrondissements (districts), all of which have their principal places, independently of the capital town of the Department itself. A certain Department is fixed upon. The Colporteurs set out, furnished with a good and extensive map of the Department which is assigned to them as the sphere of their operations, and are farther supplied with a passport and license, to ensure the protection of the authorities. An assortment of books is forwarded from Paris for them, to the chief place of every arrondissement, which thus becomes the central point of their excursions. They are uniformly recommended to begin their distributions in the country; for, whenever they meet with opposition, it is sure to arise on the part of the clergy in the towns, and it is not advisable to encounter it, until the work of dissemination has been effected in the smaller towns and villages of the neighbourhood. The Colporteurs are enjoined not to leave an arrondissement, until they are certain of having visited every place in it. In this way, they are expected to remain several months in one Department; by which means, the time, which might be wasted in desultory excursive travelling, is entirely saved. To convince himself that this regulation is strictly adhered to, M. De Pressensac keeps by him a duplicate of the map which he had given to the Colporteurs, on which he marks all the places specified in their journals: and as they do not change their place of residence but by his directions, he has an opportunity of pointing out to them any chasms which he may detect in their reports. And so minute is his surveillance, that, at the close of every month, he knows the different places which they have visited, the number of days, or even hours, spent by them in each, and the precise number of the copies of the Scriptures which they have disposed of. And as they are formally and expressly forbidden to give away the sacred volume, or to sell it under a certain reduced price, and he keeps a separate account with every Colporteur, he can check every transaction,—thereby ensuring the strictest economy, and, moreover, in such a manner as not to endanger either the spiritual work, or the temporal interests of the parent Society.

Charged with the necessary instructions, possessed of the requisite endowments, these simple peasants and artisans, in the discharge of their new duties as Colporteurs, proceed to the field which has been pointed out to them as the sphere of their future labour. They are persons making little outward show, like those itinerating hawkers, who are to be met with on the high ways in Europe, travelling on foot and heavily laden with an oil-skin bag, or a well covered basket. Passengers, meeting and entering into conversation with them on ordinary subjects, will generally find nothing to distinguish them from others of their class and condition; but after a few moments any unfavourable opinion, which they might at first have formed, will vanish, when they hear a Colporteur, whose exterior appears so unattractive, availing himself of every opportunity in the course of the conversation to speak of the "one thing needful." Ordinarily, and as much as possible, they are sent forth, two and two; and the advantages of their acting thus in concert are great. Two Colporteurs have at the very outset a greater degree of strength, for they are able to pray together; and is it not written, "If two or three of you shall agree on earth, as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father who is in heaven?" And they are also better able by their united strength, to resist the attacks which may be directed against them. In the *effective practical* development of their great object, also, two have often a decided advantage over one. For example, two of them arrive together in a town or village, and as they are expressly enjoined to call at *every* house, without passing by a single one,—one of these men takes the right, the other the left side of each street; and by so doing they are often enabled to dispose of a good number of copies which otherwise they might not have sold, as the opposition manifested on one side of the street might, perhaps, have reached the other side by the time that a *single* Colporteur would have found his way back again.

But how, it may naturally be asked—how do they prevail on an ignorant and reluctant people, not simply to *accept*, but actually to *purchase* copies of the word of God?—that word, which tends to dissipate their own fond delusions, and expose to the light of day the artifices of a powerful priesthood? Are they enjoined to be wholly silent?—Then, how can they *over-master* reluctance, and create a willingness to part with money as the price of possession? Are they, on the other hand, permitted to explain, expostulate, and persuade?—Then, are they not in danger of being ship-wrecked on the rock of *imprudent controversies*? Here, there is an apparent dilemma. But it is *apparent* only. And a path of safety, as well as a path of usefulness is found, as elsewhere, to lie in a mid-way course between extremes. On this subject, M. De Frémeaux, remarks with his usual good sense,—Were he to limit the Colporteurs to *perfect silence*, that would be almost tantamount to prohibiting them from doing any thing at all; for, generally speaking, their first offer to sell the Scriptures is met either by acts of open violence, or, as more frequently happens, with scorn and mockery. Under these circumstances, if they were altogether forbidden from joining in conversations immediately referring to the truths contained in the sacred volume which they are employed to distribute; if they were not to make use of all the eloquence with which faith in the heart inspires them, to lead blinded men to an understanding of the absolute necessity of obtaining the word of God, in order to read it with the spirit of prayer, and to make it the sole rule of their future conduct, as well as reap all the invaluable benefits to be derived from its prayerful perusal;—how could it possibly be expected that any success should crown their labours? No; they are sent to *all*, to offer to them that book which alone contains the doctrines

of salvation. It is, therefore, felt and acknowledged to be their duty to speak to all, in the spirit of meekness and forbearance, perseverance and earnestness, of the great love which God has manifested in giving his only Son Jesus Christ unto the world, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. As little ought they to be hindered, and hindered they are not, from replying, though always with mildness and simplicity, to those who ridicule and gainsay them. But on such occasions, the most peremptory injunctions are laid upon them to refrain from all *controversy*, properly so called—to speak not to men as *antagonists*, but as *immortal beings* who have *souls to be saved*, and who can only attain salvation by the conversion of the heart to the Gospel of Jesus Christ—and, in all their addresses and solicitations, to take their stand by the *fundamental truths* of Christianity which may be briefly summed up in the doctrines of the fall of man—his consequent state of condemnation—justification by faith alone—regeneration—sanctification,—in one word, *salvation*, as the work of grace and mercy of one only God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

True, it may be retorted, all this sounds very well in *theory*, but how does it work in *practice*? on this point the direct *testimonies* of M. De Pressensé are quite decisive. We know no plan of so extensive and arduous a nature which, on the whole, has wrought more admirably in its practical development. But, to minds accustomed to think, weigh and compare evidence, and especially moral evidence, no testimonies could be found more conclusive, as regards its tried and proved practicability, than those furnished, in abundance, by the ample and authentic details supplied by the journals of the Colporteurs themselves. This, however, is a species of evidence to which no justice can be done by an *abridgement*. The only resource is, to select one or two *specimens* which present an *average sample* of the whole.

In proceeding along a road, writes a Colporteur, “we met with some people who were attending to the apple trees that lined the road. I drew near to them and said, ‘The axe is laid to the root of the tree, every tree,’ &c. &c. These words, added I, have a spiritual meaning; namely, that if we do not bring forth the fruits of sanctification and righteousness, we shall be treated in like manner; and, in the course of my address I pointed out to them the necessity of becoming acquainted with the word of God. They listened to me with more than ordinary attention, purchased a New Testament, and, on my going away, thanked me heartily for the advice I had given them.”

In a small inn at a sea-port, writes another, “before quitting, I invited some persons whom I saw there, and particularly a group of sailors, who were engaged in drinking brandy, to buy my books. No one seemed disposed to listen. I renewed my offers, but all in vain, the party were too much engaged in attending to a romantic account which one of the sailors was giving of his adventures at sea. I therefore abandoned the part of an applicant and took up that of an auditor. After the sailor had finished the narration of his *fourth* shipwreck, I cried out, ‘What, four shipwrecks already, and hard upon a fifth! You are indeed, to be pitied!’ ‘How?’ returned the narrator, ‘what is that you say,—a fifth shipwreck?’ ‘Yes, indeed, my friend,’ I replied, ‘and one more dreadful than any you have yet experienced,—no less than the shipwreck of your immortal soul, unless you consult in time the pilot whom I recommend to you. You have shewn that God has spared you four times, in the most signal manner; and you still shut your ears to his warnings! It is now the fifth time that he manifests his compassion towards you, by making you an offer of his holy word; but if you refuse it, you must inevitably perish!’ My words produced a good effect; the sailors re-

mained silent, they stretched out their hands for my books, and attentively examined them. 'They are, indeed, good books,' said one of them, 'the man seems an honest man, and we can do no better than buy a copy apiece, for even if we make no use of them ourselves, they may do for our children.' In short, each bought a New Testament;—and Oh, that the Lord may give them to understand that his saving word is equally addressed to the old and to the young, and that to secure themselves against the danger of making final shipwreck, they must anchor on the Rock of ages."

A *third* Colporteur, in travelling along the road, was joined by an old soldier, to whom he offered a New Testament for sale. "I do not want it," rejoined the soldier, "for I have got a copy, which, however, I never read." On this avowal the Colporteur seized the opportunity to say a few words respecting the fall of man, the resurrection, the judgment to come, and the punishment of the wicked hereafter, &c. "Ah!" cried the soldier, "do you *believe* all this?" "Certainly: and if you were to read your New Testament you would be led to believe it also." "Well, but after all, it is only men who have written it." "To be sure; but then they were men inspired by the Holy Ghost." The soldier hereupon endeavoured to change the conversation. He extolled the bravery of the French before Constantine, and spoke of the city and of Africa generally as if he were perfectly well acquainted with them, which led the Colporteur very naturally to inquire, Whether he had been there? "Oh no," replied the other, "but I have read of all this in books that have been written by persons who have themselves been eye witnesses." "In that case," said the Colporteur, "you *believe* many things which you have *not seen*; and yet you refuse to believe many things contained in the Bible, by which your soul may be saved: and surely you must allow that that is not altogether reasonable." The soldier could not deny this, and, after much further conversation, acknowledged that he had acted wrong in not reading his Testament, which he promised in the sequel to do;—at the same time, intreating the Colporteur to call on him, for the purpose of reading it together, if he happened to pass through the village in which he lived.

"The vicar of B ——" writes a *fourth*, "inquired what books I was offering for sale. 'The New Testament,' was my reply. 'It is a very excellent book,' said the vicar, 'and if you have any French Bibles, I should be glad to purchase a copy;—but hold—while you are pursuing this calling, what religion do you profess?' 'I am of the Christian persuasion.' 'Yes, but there are different ways of being a Christian.' 'Well, then, I am an apostolical, but not a Roman, Catholic.' 'Ah, my friend, do you say so? then you are in a grievous error, and require to be converted.' 'I seek every day to follow those means which God has pointed out in order that my heart may be more and more turned to him.' 'Good, very good;—I see you are a promising young man, and consequently I must do my best to instruct you that you may be converted to the Romish Church. You, Protestants, are a mere handful; you ought to attach yourself to the more numerous party; and I will pray to the Lord through the intercession of the Holy Virgin, to bring you back to the true fold.' 'You say that we are only a handful. Do you not know that it is written, Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom?' 'Well, well, I say once more, you must join us. I will give you a letter to the Bishop, and will myself pay your expenses at the seminary, to qualify you for becoming a good Christian.' 'But, do you not remember what St. Peter said to Simon the sorcerer, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God can be purchased with money?' 'Tell

me,' he proceeded, 'do you, Protestants, believe in the three persons of the Trinity?' 'Certainly; and those who are true children of God, believe in all that the Bible teaches.' 'How so, if you do not believe in the Virgin?' 'We do believe in the Virgin, according to the Gospel; that is, we know that she bare our Saviour in the womb, and that she has been received into mercy!' 'Again, you do not believe in the merit of works.' 'The word of God tells us, ye are saved by grace, and that not of yourselves.' 'Moreover, you do not believe that a supreme head is necessary to govern the Church.' 'The Head of the Church is Christ, and He Himself has said, Neither be ye called masters; for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.'" After a good deal more of similar conversation, they parted,—the Vicar expressing himself very affectionately towards the Colporteur, and assuring him that he was not opposed to the reading of the Scriptures, but that he himself would cheerfully distribute them among his parishioners.

"An Apothecary," writes a *fifth*, "seeing me enter his house, called out, 'Well, here is our vender of Bibles! I am very glad that I bought one of you, and I read a portion of it every day with great pleasure.' I inquired of him if he believed the Bible was the word of God? 'No,' replied he, 'but I believe it to have been composed by men of great wisdom, who have written many excellent things.' 'In that case,' I replied, 'you have not experienced as much pleasure as you would have done if you had received it as the word of God.' Several persons who happened to be present, joined in the conversation; and I was called on to prove to them, which I did by a number of passages, that 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.' Unable to deny what I alleged, one of them added, that, 'after all the best religion was that of an upright man.' As the greater part of my hearers agreed with him, I proved to them that man is lost ever since the fall of Adam, and that he can only be upright in idea, and not from love, inasmuch as he is ignorant of the love of God. 'There is only one way of becoming good and upright,' I continued, 'and in order to become so,—and God himself requires that we should—the first step is to believe that the Bible is his word! This word will convince you of the love which God has shewn toward us by taking upon himself our nature, in order to satisfy the Lord in our stead, and to bear the curse which we had deserved. When you comprehend the justice of God, you will also comprehend his love; and will see that there was no other way of accomplishing our salvation, but by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Whoever believes in this sacrifice will no longer be subject to condemnation, and as soon as he becomes possessed of faith, he will not act as a hypocrite, because he will be sensible of the great love which God has had for him.' I was astonished at the attention with which I was listened to, and when I concluded, was gratified in finding that three of my auditors bought each a Bible of me."

It were easy to multiply scores of examples like the preceding. But these are sufficient to *illustrate* the way in which this simple and devoted class of men succeed, without controversy, in reaching the *hearts*, and through these, over-mastering the reluctance of an indifferent or gainsaying people. It is impossible to peruse their published journals without being fully convinced of their singular *fitness* for the work which they have undertaken, and of the singular *propriety* of the *modes* in which they endeavour to accomplish it. It is impossible not to admire the *fact*—the *aptitude*—the *fertility of invention*—the *readiness of resource*—which they constantly exhibit. Whence, then, all this fullness of thought—this command of language in appeal—this nice promptitude in repartee?—May we not conclude that it is a *realisation* of the gracious promise, that the Lord

will put in the mouths of his servants, of all ranks and conditions, such words as they are to speak for his glory? Whence again, that flow of speech, which dropping the air and aspect of vulgar illiterateness, often rises to a degree of eloquence which touches the heart?—whence that varied use of comparisons and similes, of which the most learned theologian need not be ashamed?—Is it not all simply owing, under God, to the depth and sincerity of their own convictions of Divine things, and to a peculiarly intimate acquaintance with that wondrous word, through which the Royal Psalmist could say, that he got more understanding than all his teachers?

Their outward trials, encouragements and success.

Some of the *trials* have already been unavoidably alluded to. But their own *personal* fatigues, sufferings, and reproach however severe, form the least part of their *real* trials. The injurious treatment of them has at times proceeded to the length of personal violence. There are instances of their being seized, dragged along like criminals, and imprisoned. One of them states that, after encountering a day of unusual hardship, he came to a large farm-house, where he found several labourers met together; but on offering to sell a Bible to the farmer, and to dispose of a number of New Testaments among his domestics, so greatly was the man exasperated that he actually let fly an enormous dog upon him, from whose fury he considered that he escaped only by a miracle of mercy. But their chiefest trials arise from the *ignorance and hardness of heart* every where exhibited by the great mass of the people—and from the offensive forms in which these are outwardly manifested towards the word of God itself. “All that you offer for sale,” said a man, blasphemously, to one of them, “is a mass of absurdities. Napoleon is our Jesus Christ.” “The New Testament,” said the vicar of S—, “which is selling by the Bible Colporteurs, is a book which has emanated from hell, and has been dictated by the devil himself; formerly, it was only to be found among the corrupt inhabitants of large towns, and was unknown in our villages; but, now-a-days, the gangrene is spreading, and the whole country will, ere long, be infected.” This is but a sample of the ordinary style in which numbers of enraged priests denounce and curse the Bible from their pulpits—while they threaten with excommunication all who purchase or possess copies of “the accursed thing.” Even De Sacy, the Roman Catholic Translator of the Bible is often branded as a heretic—nay worse than a heathen—and his version repudiated with bitterest execrations. Yea, it often happens, that, when a Colporteur has completed his rounds in a district, the priest, sometimes by threats of terror and sometimes by the lure of reward, contrives to get into his possession many of the copies that had been recently purchased. Then, tearing them to pieces, he throws the fragments into the fire before the eyes of the owners. “It is heart-bleeding,” remarks M. De Pressensé, “to think that sacrilegious hands have destroyed them all by fire! What a fearful religion must that be which can lead its incensed followers to act thus! You witness no such abominations in your happy land—and can you form an adequate idea of the deep affliction which those experience who contemplate them with their own eyes?—It, however, inspires them with increased energy to extend their labours.”

The *sensible encouragements and success* have also been partially adverted to. If, in many parts, the Colporteurs have been treated with indignity, scorn, and cruelty, in others, they have met with a friendly and welcome reception. If the many insult and malign them, an *élite* few have hailed them as messengers of peace. And of the maltreating

many, it would be difficult to calculate the number that has been won over by the patience, forbearance, and earnest exhortation of the Colporteurs to give good heed to the word of eternal life. Their journals abound with specific instances of every description. At R—the Commissary of Police summoned the Colporteur before him, and in a tone of menace forbade his selling or expounding the Bible—adding that the priests alone had the right to read the sacred volume. But the Colporteur in his turn read the 39th verse of 5th chapter of St. John and spoke with such earnestness that the Commissary at length said, “I have suffered myself to be betrayed into an error—I am now convinced of the truth.” He then purchased a copy himself and intreated the Colporteur frequently to call upon him. At F—the wife of the Mayor was induced to purchase a copy, and despite the threats of the Vicar, persevered in its perusal with gladness. At H—after the visit and addresses of the Colporteurs, a woman added, “As for myself, I understand nothing of what is said and done at mass—and now serve God by reading the Bible at home;” and all united in intreating the Colporteurs to visit them afterwards, in order that they might not lose the recollection of the good things which they had just heard. At M—a young female, once ignorant and bigotted, has become so penetrated with the truths of the Bible, that she has herself become a most active and eloquent Colporteur, and her belief in the Gospel has had a great influence on several. At the same place, the mother of a numerous family recently met the Colporteur, and thanked him warmly for what he had done for her house, by introducing the Bible into it, remarking that although she was any thing but rich, yet she did not begrudge the oil which was every evening consumed, by sitting up to a late hour of the night, in reading it, for it was a pleasure to her to hear the Bible read herself, and to see all her children attending to it. She added, that another of her sons was so fond of reading in the Bible, that he always took his copy along with him, carefully wrapped up in a linen cloth, when he went to work in the fields; and that it was the sweetest relaxation which he enjoyed from his heavy labours. At St. C—almost all, after listening to the Colporteur, purchased books, which were eagerly read; and one old man, in particular, afterwards gave manifest proofs of his becoming a real child of God. In the same quarter, a gentleman who had rejected the offer of a Bible with disdain, some time afterwards, came to the inn, in pursuit of the Colporteurs. Their address, he said, had made him very uneasy, and being anxious to know something of that peace of mind of which they had spoken, he had come to purchase a Bible. At L—the Colporteur called on a man, on whom he had prevailed to purchase a Bible about a year before. He stated that he continued to take great delight in reading that excellent book, and felt overpowered by the superiority of its doctrines to those he had previously followed. “Not however,” he added, “but that my manner of conducting myself since I have taken to reading the Bible exposes me to a few inconveniences; for my neighbours cry out after me because I read in the Scriptures on Sunday instead of going to mass, and my wife no longer attends the confessional since she prefers listening to me. But these little troubles do not perplex me, and when I am reviled for so doing, I merely turn to my Bible, and soon meet with passages well calculated to shut the mouths of my opponents.” At S—the Colporteur met with a man, who, though unable to read himself, had obtained a copy of the New Testament, and secured the assistance of a young man, his neighbour, to read passages to him whenever he had a little spare time. And, added he, with great feeling, “O! how sweet are the moments spent together in reading that holy book.” He, thereupon, writes the Colporteur, “begged me to act the part of his friend,

to which I readily consented ; and from the manner in which he attended to me, I feel persuaded that he has good understanding of the Scriptures." He also remarked that he was well aware that he was considered a kind of renegade, and that after his death he would probably be denied burial in the cemetery belonging to the parish ; but he concluded by saying, that it was of little consequence what they did with his body provided his soul was safe. At B—— after being denounced as a renegade, a beggar, a heretic, an infamous monster, by the priest and his partisans, and otherwise infamously treated, the Colporteur, by his meekness of demeanour and mildness of address, under insulting wrongs, moved the hearts of many of the bystanders. Seizing his advantage, he began to descant on the truth and beauty of several passages which he read aloud from the Bible. Some of his auditors were so satisfied that they loudly expressed their approval. One said, " I am heartily glad the vicar has afforded us an opportunity of hearing the Gospel explained to us in a much better manner than we have it in church." Another said, " I have lost half a day's work, but I should not mind losing a part every day, on such an occasion." A third exclaimed, " I would rather have lost six francs than missed such a fine opportunity of becoming acquainted with the truth of the Gospel." And an elderly female getting up declared, " Now I can die contented ; for after what I have just heard, I am satisfied that salvation is not of men, or of any man, but solely of God through Jesus Christ." With many exhortations to read and meditate the New Testament the Colporteur separated from them, after a stay of more than four hours, " with a heart overflowing with gratitude towards the Lord."

These are a few examples of *visible encouragement and success*, picked almost at random out of a huge mass of *similar materials*. But what these devoted men dwell on with peculiar delight is the fact, that, *not a few schoolmasters and schoolmistresses* have, by God's blessing on their persuasions and the reading of the Bible, been induced to *recommmend and teach its blessed truths to the young frequenting their schools*. Yet more, though the *general disposition of the Romanist Clergy* be decidedly hostile to Bible-dissemination, there are a good many individual instances of quite a *contrary character*—and these, as the correspondence of the Colporteurs shews, seem rather to be every year, somewhat on the increase. In one place, the *vicar himself* assists two of the Colporteurs in distributing copies of the Scriptures in his parish ;—he leads the way,—goes with them from house to house,—enters every dwelling first,—and calls upon the inmates to buy the sacred volume. In the evening he rejoins his companions in the work, for the purpose of making arrangements for the supply of a depôt of the Scriptures, expresses his anxiety to continue the distribution, and promises to use his utmost endeavours to promote the good cause for which he feels enough cannot be done. " Tell those who employ you," he repeats to the Colporteurs, when bidding them farewell ; " tell them I shall be very happy to dispose of a good number of copies, and that it is understood between us that I shall hereafter render an exact account of the books entrusted to my care." In another place, a priest urges the schoolmaster to profit by the visit of the Colporteur to obtain a supply of New Testaments, declaring it to be his wish that every family in his parish might become possessed of a copy. Again, at a place more remote, a respectable and aged dean is seen purchasing a considerable number of copies of the sacred volume for the benefit of the poor in his parish, and is heard publicly exhorting his flock from the pulpit to do the same, and to read and study the word of God. " The vicar of St. —," (writes a Colporteur,) " was much pleased at my selling a large number of copies among his parishioners,

and exhorted them carefully and with prayer, to read them. For this, I desire to thank the Lord with my whole heart." Other Colporteurs write:—"At M—— the vicar received us very cordially, invited us into the vicarage-house, and pressed us to partake of a collation. After having refreshed ourselves, we had some interesting conversation, and he then pointed out every house to us, where he was desirous that the word of God might be purchased; and, at parting, entreated us to visit him whenever we had occasion to pass through his place. At N—— I entered the house of a priest, without any previous acquaintance, and inquired if he were disposed to purchase a Bible. 'Oh! you are a Protestant?' said he. 'I am, Sir.' 'Well, I do not blame you for it; for a Protestant may be a very upright man.' Hereupon a friendly conversation ensued between us. I endeavoured to explain to him the nature of my belief, by speaking to him of my state of condemnation on account of sin, and of the grace which is in Christ Jesus, who died for our justification. He was much pleased with what I said, and told me I should make a good Catholic; but that it was a pity I was not more enlightened. I expressed a similar sentiment in respect to himself. After dwelling at some length on the great object of all our hope, he said, 'You really are a worthy young man, and I will buy a couple of your books.' He accordingly took a Bible and New Testament, for which he paid the cost price; and when I was about to return him the change, he refused to receive it, saying that it was a small contribution towards the work in which I was engaged. At T—— I had left eight New Testaments in charge of the vicar, and on my return he told me with unfeigned regret, that he had not succeeded in disposing of them; but that he would seek to distribute them among the poor of his acquaintance, and, in the mean time would pay for them himself. It was at his suggestion that the schoolmaster of the commune had, on a former occasion, bought thirty copies of me."

Doubtless, to true believers, the *grand source of encouragement* is to be found in the *commands and promises of the Eternal Himself*, and in the *full assurance* that the work is *His own*, and that *He* will bless both it and them who labour to promote it. But, constituted as we are, it cannot also be doubted, that facts like the preceding are cheering to the soul, confirmatory of faith, and fraught with encouragement to persevere. Yea, though there were no tokens of the bearing of *actual fruit*, would there not be ample encouragement in the *fact*, that there is not in France, as in Italy, any state-prohibition against the free circulation of the Scriptures—and especially in this other great and notorious *fact*, that, during last year, not fewer than 117,431 copies of these were *sold*, in different parts of the country, by *Colporteurs alone*? Why, if there had been no appearance whatever, *as yet*, of any outward visible fruit at all, would not the *bare fact* of the *voluntary purchase* of upwards of one hundred and seventeen thousand copies of the word of God, in a country like France, be itself an evidence and memorial of splendid success?—success, in this peculiar department of Christian philanthropy, without a precedent? And let what abatements and deductions any one pleases be made, in reference to the speedy gratification of a temporarily excited curiosity, and consequent return into old habits of indifference—frequent relapses into the credulity of superstition, or the incredulity of scepticism—occasional outbreaks of persecution among the local civil authorities, and reiterated outrages on the part of infuriated Romish priests;—even in the face of all this, is it probable, is it possible, is it even conceivable that such a prodigious number of copies of the Word of Life should be actually *bought with a price*—and all in vain?—that the *whole* of this precious seed should fall either by the way-side, or among thorns, or on rocky

places, and none on the soil of a good and honest heart? No;—the promises of Jehovah, the history of his church, and the experience of thousands of his saints alike denounce the credibility of such a supposition.

Still, it may be asked, as it often has been,—If the cause of Bible-circulation has been making such extraordinary progress in France, how comes it that so little of its good effects appear in improving the public tone, sentiments, and conduct of its vain-glorious, superstitious, and Godless people? To this the reply is obvious. The spring-season must be allowed to pass away, ere the season of harvest can be expected. The foundations must be allowed to be dug, ere the superstructure can rear its head towards the skies. In both these cases, and in both alike, most of the *earlier and more indispensable parts* of the work are long carried on very much *under-ground*. The living seed, the germ of after-luxuriance, is deposited beneath the clod and concealed from the eye of sense; the corner-stone, the main prop of the future edifice, is buried in the earth and covered from outward view. And so it ever has been, and is now, in the grand process of this world's *spiritual husbandry and architecture*. Much, very much of the labour of sowing the spiritual seed and of founding the spiritual temple, is conducted without attracting external observation. Yea, *something of real fruit* is often reaped, and *well nigh the whole preparatory work* accomplished, while the careless and unreflecting are still unconscious of progress, or drowsily dreaming that nothing at all is doing, or can be done.

This subject, so all-important in estimating the *real character and effects of Missionary labour in general*, is presented in a very simple but striking light by M. De Pressensé; and with his own statement our analysis of the reports of that devoted servant of God must close. "A superficial judgment," says he, in commencing his last report, "ought not to be formed of the present state of religion in France; for were that done, and were outward appearances alone considered, it is certain that we might even be led to doubt of the means which have been employed, for more than twenty years for diffusing the knowledge of gospel truths in this country. Such a mode of proceeding is, moreover, unbecoming a Christian, who knows that, in general, the kingdom of God on earth does not come with parade and show, but that what the world regards as small things, scarcely deserving of a cursory glance, is commonly the beginning of a glorious work, over which the angels in heaven rejoice, while they adore the power and love of Him who is the author of it. Is it not actually upon record that "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise;—and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen;—yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are, that no flesh should glory in his presence."

"The foregoing observation reminds me of a visit which one of your countrymen recently paid to this country. After landing at Calais, he traversed the whole length of France, on his way to the Departments in the south. On his arrival there he lamented to a Christian friend the sight which, on his lengthened tour, had presented itself to his eyes. "It is reported (he said) that there are Christians who are engaged in promoting the spread of the Redeemer's kingdom in France, but where are they? and what are they doing? Wherever I have been, I have seen nothing but evident traces of superstition, proofs of infidelity and impiety;"—and in support of this, he brought forward the general profanation of the sabbath. "Alas!" continued he, "if Christians are really doing any thing in this country, it is altogether in vain; and the

good seeds which they sow fall to a certainty either by the way-side, and the fowls have come and devoured them up, - or upon stony places, where they have forthwith sprung up, only to be scorched by the sun, or to be choked by thorns!" "Wait a little," replied the friend, who was better acquainted with the true state of the country—"wait a little, and perhaps you may soon be convinced that, if what you say be true in a general sense, it is, nevertheless, also true, that in France, as elsewhere, a portion—though, alas! but the smallest portion—of the precious seed falls into good ground, and brings forth fruit." In fact, our traveller soon had an opportunity of finding that he was wrong in the superficial judgment which he formed. The state of his health first led him to visit certain baths in the south of France, were, to his great joy, he met with several Frenchmen who were sincere disciples of the Saviour,—persons who laboured with zeal in the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures, and who had succeeded in gathering around them a considerable number of attentive hearers of the word. Obligated, after a time, to quit these baths, he proceeded to others more congenial to the restoration of his health, and there, too, he found Christian brethren, and, among the rest, a minister of the gospel, whose endeavours had been eminently successful among a crowd of visitors. In short, our traveller, after making the tour of five or six different bathing-places, found at each, and that within the short space of a few weeks, Frenchmen of all conditions, who devoted themselves to making known the truths of the gospel to those among whom they had taken up their temporary abode; and the gratifying intelligence which he received respecting the advancement of the kingdom of God in the various places of their ordinary residence, convinced him that it was no exaggeration to maintain that, within the last twenty years, the gospel had obtained signal victories in France. Such are the sentiments which you too would express, were you carefully to examine every part of France. Like the traveller just alluded to, you would be astonished to find Christian brethren in places where you had before been afflicted by witnessing appearances of superstition and infidelity; and as it is written that a little leaven suffices to leaven the whole lump, you would share in the brighter hopes entertained by French Christians with respect to the future state of their terrestrial country."

Such is, on the whole, a succinct, and it is to be hoped, faithful *summary* of the *leading facts and principles*, connected with the system of *Bible Colportage* in France—as variously abridged, selected, and compiled from the able and elaborate but unsystematic reports annually sent by M. De Pressensé to the Parent Society. A wide field is hereby opened up for retrospective and prospective remark—as well as a fertile theme for thanksgiving to the Father of Spirits. Time and space will hardly allow us to do more than simply to start the question,—How far is a system, which has succeeded so remarkably in France, *suited* to the peculiar exigencies of India? As different soils require different *modes* of husbandry, it does not *necessarily* follow that an *external scheme* of *culture* which is found eminently adapted to, and successful in, one country, must be *equally* adapted to, and successful in, another. Here is room for the exercise of *practical wisdom*. That there are specific differences between the circumstances

of the inhabitants of these two countries, as regards their mental, moral, and religious associations and predispositions, requires no proof. One obvious distinguishing characteristic is, that, in India, the people are *antecedently* wedded to an ancestral faith and sacred books, which disown and are wholly repugnant to the Bible. Whereas, in France, however ignorant the people may be of its contents, the Bible is generally recognised, under one form or other, as true, and having some authority. There, the Bible, however restricted in its use and influence, nominally and theoretically, receives from most, some homage or acknowledgment, as the ultimate standard of appeal, in matters of religious faith, doctrine, and practice. In India, therefore, the national predisposition is *naturally*, as much *against*, as in France, it may be expected to be *in favour of*, the Bible—as the *book of God*. But have we not thousands belonging to the Romish Church in India? True, but they too are, in general, *heathenized* to an unwonted degree; and, for the most part, in respect to attributes of manly growth, prove themselves to be of an *inferior type and mould*, compared with their co-religionists in France. This, again, suggests another notable difference between the two countries, and that is the amount of *reasonable probability* in securing *qualified agents*. Hitherto, the curse of previous *imbecility* and *unmanliness*, seems, with a few pleasing exceptions, to cleave to all native converts, who had no proper training—no bracing—in youth. Would to God that we saw, or had the strong hope of *speedily* seeing, amongst them, a high-toned, high-principled *adult* race, of the same stamp and make as the Colporteurs of France!

Would we, then, reject the system of French Colportage as *wholly* unsuited to the circumstances of India? *By no means*. While wisdom demands that we should not shut our eyes at differences which must enhance the practical difficulties, faith and holy fortitude forbid our being repelled by the loud shout, “A lion in the way,” till the experiment be fairly tried, and the obstacles proved to be altogether insurmountable. But, has this yet been done? No;—Then, why not *try*? We have a Bible Society and a Bible Association;—is it not within their scope and province to sanction an *experiment*—to devise and superintend its details? Probably it might be found, in the issue, that a great deal more may be done in this department of Christian philanthropy, than has yet been deemed either advisable or practicable? And such result might be found, not only among the enslaved votaries of the Church of Rome, but even among the blinded heathen; and more especially among the more unsophisticated natives of the interior,

who have not been despoiled of any remnant of better qualities that may have clung to them as Hindus, by the introduction of vices and villanies of foreign growth and import. But are we *prepared* for such a work? Partly to adopt, and partly to modify and accommodate, some of the concluding words and sentiments of two of the last parts of the British and Foreign Bible Society, we would again ask, "*Are we prepared?*"—with reference not more to the magnitude of the work itself, than to the peculiar difficulties with which it is beset? Are we prepared?—with reference to our own motives, principles, and self-sacrificing devotedness? Have we that deep, and full, and irrepressible conviction of the supreme excellence and paramount authority, and, for all the essential matters of religion, entire sufficiency of the written word of God, which we ought to have, and must have, to ensure our labouring in this cause (as we alone *can* labour with any prospect of success) with unwearied devotion? Are we so entirely satisfied of the goodness and rectitude of the undertaking in which we would embark, as to disregard every form of opposition, in our attempts to give to God's own creatures the precious record of his truth and love? Are we prepared to go forward in this great work, with all the patience, self-denial, and long-suffering, which become the followers of the meek and lowly, yet untiring Redeemer? Are we prepared to go forth *together*, 'laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil-speaking?' Can we, with the simplicity of little children—can we, 'as new-born babes, desire,' for others as well as for ourselves, 'the sincere milk of the word, that we may grow thereby?' Are we prepared to do all this out of pity to the souls of men perishing for lack of knowledge, and out of reverence for the Father of Spirits—our Father in heaven—concerning whose name we pray so constantly that it may be hallowed, and who has magnified his word above all his name:—out of love, moreover, to the adorable Redeemer, whose death is the foundation of our highest hopes, and whose sufferings and subsequent glory the angels desire to look into;—doing it still in humble dependance on God the Holy Ghost, to illumine and quicken the hearts of men, and render effectual to their salvation the truths contained in the written word? Are we thus prepared, with Christian fortitude, yet with Christian meekness,—in a spirit of zeal and lofty enterprize, yet at the same time of faith, humility, and prayer—laying aside inferior differences—one in effort, and, as it respects this object at least, one in heart;—are we prepared to come and thus consecrate ourselves afresh to this blessed service? Alas, when we examine our own hearts,

there is much to humble us—sluggishness, the most inert—and soul-devouring carnality. When we look around there is much to humble us—a visible church, torn and convulsed with internal strife—an apostate world, still slumbering in ignorance and guilt, or, if aroused at all, only roused to rage against the Lord and his Anointed. But, wherever we turn our eyes, inward or outward, about us or beyond us, all things in the social, moral, and spiritual state of ourselves and mankind at large, seem to bid us to advance. The call to go forward is too loud to be misunderstood, too piercing and solemn to be resisted. Turning, then, from the troubled scene of self, and of the Church, and of the world, let us look upwards to the hills, whence alone our help *can* come. ‘The Lord on high is mightier far than the noise of many waters.’ He, to whom all power is given in heaven and in earth, ‘the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last,’ will not fail to execute—

His bright designs,
And work his sovereign will.

We would therefore hear and obey what we believe to be *His* voice, and would know no watchword but, *Onward and Forward.*”

A. D.

THE
WATCHMAN'S WARNING VOICE ;
A S E R M O N ,

PREACHED ON LORD'S-DAY MORNING

NOVEMBER 27, 1842.

BY

JAMES CHARLES, D. D.

CHAPLAIN ON THE H. E. I. COMPANY'S BENGAL ESTABLISHMENT, AND SENIOR
MINISTER OF ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH, CALCUTTA.

[FROM THE CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.]

CALCUTTA :

PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, CIRCULAR ROAD.

1843.

THE
WATCHMAN'S WARNING VOICE.

“ Watchman, what of the night ? Watchman, what of the night ? ”
ISAIAH xxi. 2.*

DIFFERENT interpretations have been given of the verses in which this reiterated question occurs, but not one of these can be pronounced perfectly satisfactory. The only point respecting them, indeed, in reference to which commentators seem to be agreed is, that they are pre-eminently obscure, enigmatical, and hard to be understood. You will not expect me, then, even to make the attempt to elucidate their primary import ; nor is the solution of the difficulty connected with them necessary to the end which I have in view, in selecting them as the basis of this morning's meditations. Suffice it to observe that the question contained in them appears to have been proposed in vision to the prophet by one of the Edomites, or inhabitants of Idumæa, who not less than the people of Judah were menaced with the hostile irruption of a Babylonian army ; and that the object of it was to ascertain whether he descried any alarming appearances, any symptoms of danger, while he maintained his lonely station on his watch-tower, amid the gloom and silence of the night.

Now, as I shewed at large this day fortnight,† the office of a watchman or sentinel is one of the emblems which God himself has made use of in holy Scripture to represent the function of the Christian minister and the obligations attached to it—his duty being to be vigilant of observation, and prompt and faithful in sounding the alarm ; to look out, and to speak out ; to range his eye over the field both of the world and of the Church, that he may mark every thing, as it arises in either, which portends evil to the cause that ought to be dearest to his heart, and give timely and distinct warning of it ; and especially to be ever at his post in the posture of keen circumspection, with heart

* This discourse was preached in the forenoon of the fourth Lord's-day in November last, in the ordinary course of the Author's ministrations. It was prepared without the most remote view to publication ; and it appears in its present form in deference to the opinion of more than one individual connected with this periodical who heard it delivered, and who thought that the views contained in it were of sufficient importance to receive a wider circulation, than the pulpit could give them.

† In a sermon on Ezekiel, xxxiii. 7.

and eyes intently engaged, that he may discover and make known to his flock the perils, temptations, and trials which threaten them either as a body or as individuals.

This being undeniably the case, I shall suppose that some individual among you, awake to the best interests of his never-dying soul and anxious to promote them, addresses to me the question "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?" and shall attempt in the sequel to frame an appropriate answer to it. My aim, in other words, shall be, to point out some of the things from which you as a Christian congregation in India are peculiarly in danger, or by which you are most liable to be injuriously affected, and to warn you to be on your guard against them. I shall notice, you will perceive, only those spiritual dangers to which you as a body or as distinct classes are exposed; for to proclaim with a warning voice the special dangers arising from the difference of temperaments, stations in life, avocations, connections, and success, which environ you as individuals, belongs rather to the duties of the private pastorate, than to those of the public ministration of the word.

Many and various are the particulars which might be enumerated as tending in the directest manner to endanger your spiritual welfare or retard your progress in divine things; these, of course, consisting partly of such as are in some measure common to you with others, and partly of such as spring out of the adverse circumstances amid which you are placed in this foreign and heathen land.

I. The first which I shall specify, arises from superficial views of the extent of spiritual religion, or of the claims and obligations of the gospel.

It is cheerfully admitted that things in this respect are not at such a melancholy point of depression as they had reached, at a time not long gone by. A decided and gratifying change has taken place—a change which stands out in bolder relief and with greater prominence to the eye of those, whose Indian residence has extended over a considerable number of years, than can be well imagined by such as have only recently commenced their sojourn in this land of the sun. But how far has this revolution proceeded—what in a general way may be defined as the limits to which it has reached? That the religion of the gospel is no longer the vilified, repudiated, forgotten thing that it was in the days of other years—that those on whom the name of Christ has been named are no longer banded together as in an unholy confederacy to cast aside every external recognition of it, and to treat it as if it were a cunningly devised fable, a vile fabrication, or a puerile superstition—that, on the contrary, it is greeted by them with positive marks of homage and respect, and the profession of it is deemed at least an element of respectability of character, while the known contempt for its divinely accredited claims is regarded, if not as a brand or stigma, at least as a thing by which a man is worsened in public estimation—that the Sabbaths of the Lord are no longer so generally or so grossly profaned—that the churches are better frequented than they were wont to be, at least during one of the ordinary services, and the ordinances more reverently observed—that family worship and the

other offices of domestic piety are attended to by a wider circle—and that the moral tone of society is to a considerable extent heightened and improved—will, if I mistake not, be fully and thankfully conceded by every one who is competent to pronounce a judgment in the matter. And while these outward and visible signs of improvement are exhibited in the mass of our professedly Christian community, it will be further allowed that there are among us those who are hopefully pious, and a few at least who are earnestly and unequivocally on the Lord's side, and who by an act of personal devotion have consecrated themselves to His blessed and ennobling service—a few who, though they came to this land merely with the view of amassing worldly wealth, have through the loving kindness of God found in it a far more precious treasure, even “the pearl of great price;” and who in the midst of a region, in which heathenish darkness and spiritual desolation reign, have happily for themselves been persuaded to tread with vigorous steps the path to “glory, honor, and immortality,” though they were never induced to enter upon it amid all the superior illumination and all the hallowing influences of the country of their birth!

But, when all this has been said, has not almost every thing been advanced which can with truth be alleged on our behalf? And after every thing has been conceded which can be claimed, even according to the most partial and favorable estimate, does it not remain true, indisputably true, that real, vital, experimental religion is at a low ebb in the community of which we are members—that the proportion of merely nominal Christians far, very far, out-numbers that of those, in whom Christianity is a living, breathing, operative principle, in whom it is, so to speak, embodied, and by whom it is faithfully acted out—and that, while there is much outward profession, there is little, very little of the self-denial, the humility, the tenderness of conscience, the watchfulness against the occasions of sinning, the deadness to the world, the heavenly-mindedness, and the spirit of self-sacrificing love and active piety, by which outward profession ought ever to be characterized and sustained?

Let me carry the appeal to your own consciences. While you are not unobservant of the positive institutions of the Christian economy, and while you may, besides, exhibit the decencies and proprieties of a Christian profession, can you venture to affirm that you have a good hope, that you have undergone the holy and blessed change of nature, which the great Teacher represented under the figure of being born again or from above; that the love of Christ reigns supremely in your hearts, imparts its hallowed glow to all your feelings and affections, and determines the complexion of your conduct; and that you are ever striving, in believing dependance on the aids of the Spirit's grace, to mortify innate corruption, to cultivate the principle of faith in increasing measures of purity, liveliness, and vigour, to exemplify a more exact conformity to the divine will, and to grow in meetness for the subliming employments, and the sinless delights of the heavenly world? Can you even affirm that this is the point of attainment to which your aspirations, your prayers, and your exertions are constantly directed—the goal towards which you are strenuously tending, and which you fervently

desire to reach. I trust there are some among you who are prepared humbly, but decidedly, to adopt this language ; but ah ! how many more are there who will shrink back from doing so, and who by admitting that they stop far short of such an elevated standard of Christian discipleship, and are not even seeking to approximate to it, do in effect admit that there is a want of thoroughness in their religion, and that they entertain superficial views of what the gospel requires of all its avowed adherents !

This want of thoroughness in the religious character and attainments of those of whom our professedly Christian community is composed, amid all the respect which they show to religion, this allowed coming-short on their part of the claims and obligations of the glorious gospel of Christ may perhaps proceed from one or both of these two causes. The one is, that having been induced to bestow a larger measure of attention than they once did upon the things that belong to their everlasting peace—being conscious that a wide distance intervenes between their present and their former condition in reference to the momentous concerns of religion—their anxieties are soothed down, their consciences are lulled into a state of repose, they think they have gone far enough, and to go farther would subject them to the dreaded charge of enthusiasm, and, therefore, they remain satisfied with the amount of progress made by them in the right direction, limited and inadequate as it is, and “fail of the grace of God.” The other is, that the general average of Christian attainment and Christian effort in the Church visible in this place is so low—that there are so few eminent examples among us of holiness, heavenly-mindedness, and consecration to God, who, by affording a faithful exhibition of what spiritual religion really is, may silently but powerfully force home upon others the conviction of their short-comings and imperfections, rouse them from their self-complacent dreams, and stimulate them to embark in the earnest and sustained endeavour to rise to “the full stature of perfect manhood in Christ Jesus.”

But whether the causes of the low state of vital religion among us have been correctly assigned or not, there can be no doubt that it exists ; and as little doubt can there be that, in the measure in which it exists, it is fraught with serious danger, and tends to re-act with a baleful influence on those who wear the badges of a Christian profession. For what says that blessed book which is as a guide to direct us, as a beacon to warn us, as a touchstone to enable us to distinguish the false from the true, the specious from the solid, the dangerous from the safe ? Throughout its pages it is proclaimed in language plain, unambiguous, and emphatic, that all the children of men may, as far as their present characters and their future prospects are concerned, be ranged in two great classes—those who, having received the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation and been regenerated and sanctified by His Spirit, are treading “the narrow way that leadeth unto life,” and those who, being strangers to the saving knowledge of Him, and pervaded by the principles and feelings of ungodliness, are crowding “the broad road that leadeth unto destruction.” These two classes, indeed, are

capable of being sub-divided into others ; for, on the one hand, there are degrees of spiritual illumination and holy attainment among those who sincerely follow the Saviour, and, on the other, all who are not " in Him " are not equally far from His kingdom. But the line which separates them is broadly drawn ; and while it is true that all who are on the one side of it, whatever may be the diversities which subsist between them, are safe, at peace with God, and " sealed unto the day of redemption," it is not less true that all who are on the other side of it, at whatever point of approximation they may stand, lie under the judicial anger of the Lord Jehovah and are obnoxious to all the horrors of the coming wrath !

This is the truth of God, the solemn and unchangeable truth ; and because this is the truth, you, my dear hearers, are in danger from every view which, however specious, attractive, or popular it may be, does not coincide with it :—because this is the truth, you are liable to be injuriously affected by the lax and superficial notions respecting spiritual religion which extensively prevail. Hear, then, the watchman's warning voice. Awake, awake all of you to serious and prayerful consideration ! Beware of becoming the victims of false and unscriptural views of the requirements and obligations of the gospel. Ponder it again and again that religion must be all in all with you, or it is nothing ; and that there is and, indeed, can be but one kind, though there may be different degrees, of genuine, safe, and acceptable religion. It is well that you offer the homage of your respect to things sacred—it is well that starting from the stupor of spiritual indifference you devote some measure of attention to the concerns of your undying souls—it is well that with all outward reverence you wait upon the services of the sanctuary, that you read your bibles, that you pray in your closets and in your families, and that you do many other things which quadrato with the rule of your duty ; but if with all this fair show, the root of the matter is not in you—if you rest short of true repentance, of unfeigned faith in Christ, and of genuine conversion to God—be assured that all besides will avail you nothing, and that at last you will find that " the covering is narrower than you can wrap yourselves in it," and that it is with you " even as when a hungry man dreameth and behold he eateth, but he awaketh and his soul is empty ; or as when a thirsty man dreameth and behold he drinketh, but he awaketh, and behold he is faint, and his soul hath appetite !" Pause, therefore, and reflect how it really is with you as regards your everlasting salvation, instead of taking it for granted that all is well. Make the bible, and the bible alone your standard of judgment ; and let it be your daily prayer that the Holy Spirit, whose province it is to convince of sin, may never give you rest and never cease to strive with you till the word of God work in you effectually, and you are not only outwardly reformed but inwardly renewed, till you are not only moral but spiritual, till you not only " put on Christ " by profession, but are assimilated to His image and conformed to His example. In fine let the grand principle which inspired and actuated the great Apostle be also yours, and let the practice which he exemplified be exemplified by you. What was his principle ? " Yea doubtless and I count all things

but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith!" And what was his practice? "This one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those which are before, I press towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

2. The second danger which I would specify is connected with excessive addiction to worldly business, and conformity to the world.

It has often been remarked that here no one is idle—that here there are no sinecures; and, though there may be some exaggeration in the remark, it still rests upon a large substratum of truth. It is not in this country as in Britain, where the gradations of rank are both more in number and more distinctly marked, where wealth is more unequally distributed, and where many, either from being born to affluence or having acquired a competency, are raised above the necessity of labouring for their subsistence in any one of the varied departments of human industry and skill. Here, on the contrary, every man from the highest to the lowest has the routine of his office, the pursuits of his profession, or the business of his calling to attend to: here every man is the architect of his own fortune in the only sense in which this phrase can be legitimately used, and, as he was mainly induced to leave behind him all the endearments of home, and to encounter strange faces and stranger tongues in an ungenial clime, by the hope of amassing wealth, his grand object is to amass wealth as speedily as possible, that he may return to enjoy it amid the scenes in which his earlier days were passed, and among which memory still loves to linger. For these reasons, and also because the climate almost wholly precludes individuals from undertaking excursions of pleasure and travelling from place to place for recreation or amusement, occupation if not more severe here than elsewhere is perhaps closer, more constant, and seldom remitted.

Now the professed followers of Christ are in danger of being borne onward by the force of the prevailing current—of being infected by the wide spread contagion—of becoming too much and too exclusively engrossed by worldly avocations, and even taking time from devotion to give to business—of allowing the pressing concerns of time to occupy an inordinate measure of their regard, and to displace from their thoughts the far higher and far more momentous concerns of eternity—of attaching a misplaced importance to the realization of a fortune, and making this too much the object for which they live—and of catching up wrong impressions in regard to all the things of this present world, prizing them far beyond their intrinsic worth, and pursuing them with an ardour which is excessive.

And while they are thus exposed to a strong temptation to become immoderately addicted to worldly business, they are not less in danger of gliding into a forbidden conformity to that corrupt system of things, which in Holy Scripture is denominated "the world." For there is not,

generally speaking, in the city in which we dwell, such a marked separation between the Church and the world, between those who live for eternity and those who are all for time, as is witnessed in some other Christian communities; the line of demarcation is not so broadly and distinctly drawn between the two classes; the intercourse that subsists between them is greater, more frequent, and of a more intimate character; and they are not so widely distinguished from each other in their equipage, their style of living, the display of their social entertainments, and their general expenditure.

Now that the professed followers of Christ must, so far as their spiritual interests are concerned, be injuriously affected by yielding to the two-fold temptation of excessive devotion to business and of conformity to the world, is beyond all doubt. The great Prophet of the Church himself has taught us, that "the word is choked and rendered unfruitful by the care of this world and the deceitfulness of riches," and has, besides, solemnly warned us to "take heed to ourselves lest at any time our hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life"—a warning in reference to which it has been well observed, that "a heart overcharged with the cares of the world is as much disqualified for converse with God and for walking in the Spirit as it would be by surfeiting and drunkenness, to which, by their tendency to intoxicate and stupify, they bear a strong resemblance." Nor is it less certain that conformity to the world in its spirit, its ways, its fashions, and its amusements, exerts an influence adverse to genuine piety. In the very measure in which this is exemplified, it tends powerfully to dissipate seriousness of mind, to lower and blunt the tone of spirituality, to beget languor in the religious affections and cast a blight upon them, to induce a want of relief for the private exercises of devotion, and to excite into baleful activity principles, dispositions, and feelings which war against the best interests of the soul, and which are commanded to be mortified and subdued. And has not the visible church in this city afforded several lamentable proofs of the substantial accuracy of both of these allegations? Has it not been seen once and again that in proportion as individuals have immersed themselves in worldly business, have succeeded in their professional career, have been advanced to posts of honor and dignity, or have accumulated wealth, they have relaxed in their attention to things spiritual, have become formal and remiss in their religious duties, and have, to say the least of it, evinced a less eager desire to cultivate the society of the "lovers of God" and of godliness? Has it not been seen once and again that individuals by allowing themselves to be drawn within the vortex of worldly society, and being exposed to the full tide of the blandishments of splendid parties of pleasure, have sustained the twofold injury of an increased attachment to things which are "of the earth earthy," and an impaired tone of religious sensibility, and have retrograded instead of going forward in the way to Zion?

Yes! my dear friends, there is danger, great danger, to be apprehended from a too busy engrossment in worldly avocations and pursuits, and from conformity to the world. Hear, then, the watchman's

warning voice. Strive to keep down worldly-mindedness, and to resist the engrossing power of worldly things. Beware of indulging an immoderate attachment to mere wealth, and of seeking as a paramount object to become rich. Be on your guard continually against the encroachments of the spirit of the world, which is of a most subtle, insidious, and ensnaring nature, and which is perpetually apt to insinuate itself into your minds, and to mix itself up with your tastes, affections, and desires, with your business, your pleasures, and even your devotions. Seek earnestly to acquire the habit of regarding all its pomps, and vanities, and fashions, and amusements, and companies, in the light of God's word, and close your ears and steel your hearts against whatever would induce you to compromise your principles and to conform to the practices of worldliness. And while you attend to these directions never lose sight of this great practical truth, that the Spirit of Christ, received and cherished by faith, alone will cast out the spirit of the world, and that it is only the superior love of things unseen and eternal which will expel from your bosoms the inordinate love of the things of time and sense, and avail to moderate your excessive pursuit of them. For what says the scripture—"This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"

(3) The third danger to which I would advert is connected with living too much in public, and not having occasional seasons of devotional retirement.

No thoughtful observer will, I think, be disposed to controvert the position, that the inward and retired exercises of spiritual religion are characteristic neither of this time nor of this place. The age in which we live is rather impressed with the character of restless and untiring activity than imbued with the calm spirit of meditation, and is distinguished by energetic exertion and vigorous concentration of effort, rather than by quiet and contemplative habits. And it is at once the cause and the effect of this phasis of society that men of all ranks come more forward than they were wont to do, are less retired in their manner of living, act more under the public gaze, and unite more together for the purpose of carrying forward those plans and enterprises which piety or benevolence has projected. This state of things is conspicuous here, as well as elsewhere; though undoubtedly the form and mode under which it meets the view among us take a somewhat peculiar character from the peculiarity of our social circumstances. What between official or professional occupation, paying and receiving visits, taking exercise in the open air, and mingling in the delights of friendly intercourse at the close of the day, there are not a few whose time is almost wholly passed in public, and who can scarcely ever be said to be alone. And even they who do not thus live perpetually in the broad eye of day, and who are quite apart from the fret and the bustle, the distractions and the collisions of public employments, are yet almost constantly in the view of those who compose their family circles, and remain strangers to self-communion in private. Of very few, it is to be feared, can it be predicated that they have stated

seasons of retirement for the purpose of promoting self-improvement and cultivating habits of spiritual contemplation—a practice to which, it must be admitted, the structure of our houses presents considerable obstacles, since it is difficult to find a place in them in which we shall not have eye or at least ear-witnesses of our devotions.

Now the best interests of piety are endangered by this state of things. It is the testimony of all experience that the followers of Christ, even by being “in the world” only so far as duty calls them, have their spirit of devotion impaired, the liveliness of their spiritual principles blunted, and the force and fervour of their spiritual feelings abated; and that they scarcely ever altogether escape the contagion of corrupting examples, or fail to be more or less affected by the sentiments, views, and conduct of the men of a different spirit from themselves, with whom they come in contact. To repair this waste, to counteract this evil they need, imperiously need, seasons of devotional retirement—seasons in which they may cultivate secret communion with the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, read His precious word, maintain spiritual converse with the objects of measureless interest which He has revealed in it to the eye of faith, and seek to infix in their hearts vivid impressions of their reality and value; and just in the measure in which they observe such seasons and engage aright in such holy exercises, their languid affections are revived, their faith is heightened and invigorated, their wasted spirits are recruited, and strength both for duty and for trial is infused into them afresh. Never to have recourse to this compensating process, wholly to fail thus to alternate times of devotional retirement with times of public exertion, would be fraught with dire injury to their souls!

And if this practice be so indispensibly necessary in the case even of advanced Christians, surely it can never be prudently or safely dispensed with by those who have only recently entered on the Christian course, or who are still ranged in the class of “almost Christians.” Hear, then, the watchman’s warning voice. Beware of living too much in public. Seek from time to time to be alone with God. Cherish, carefully cherish, the spirit of private devotion. Have stated seasons for retired devotional reading and meditation, and never permit yourselves even in your busiest days wholly to neglect them. It is only, remember, by narrowing the current that you can deepen the stream; only by gathering up and concentrating the attention, that you can intensify the feeling. Seek, therefore, to be often alone, and meditate on the things of God till you discern more of their surpassing excellency and glory, and feel more of their purifying and subliming power. “Arise,” said God to his prophet of old, “arise, go forth into the plain, and I will *there* talk with thee!”

(4.) The fourth danger to which I would advert is connected with lax and unscriptural notions of the observance of the Lord’s day.

This holy day, it has already been admitted, is neither so generally nor so grossly profaned in this place, as it was at a period not very remote from the present. But, after making every allowance for the improvement that has taken place, is it yet observed according to either the letter or the spirit of the commandment? Nay, is it yet observed as the most

of you have been privileged to see it observed in the rural districts, and even in the large cities of our beloved father-land? Oh! remember ye not the sacred stillness of the Lord's-day morn, when all nature was hushed into repose as if in unison with the season, and no sound was heard save that of the little choristers of the grove warbling forth in tuneful concert their liquid notes of praise? Remember ye not the decent and well-ordered groupes that streamed forth from different points of the prospect on that day of rest, and exchanged their friendly and yet chastened greetings as they met in the "place of your fathers' sepulchres," through which they wended their way to the Parish Church? Remember ye not the entire cessation from worldly business, the release of all classes down to the lowest from their weekly toil, the withdrawal of children from the streets, and the almost total desertion of the public haunts? Remember ye not the hallowed exercises of the Lord's day eve, when father and mother and all the members of the household were assembled, and the catechism was repeated and explained, and the Word of life was reverently read, and the fervent prayer was offered up—all sounds of levity or boisterous mirth being the while excluded as unbefitting the occasion and its solemn objects? Remember ye not these scenes—scenes which when vividly recalled enter the very soul, and bathe it as with heaven's pure and refreshing dews—and say if there be ought that reminds you of them in the manner in which you see the holy day observed now? Alas! Alas! How wide the difference—how faint, how imperfect the resemblance! Need I tell any of you how much the sabbath of the Lord is still profaned, and in what a variety of ways its sacred repose is invaded and broken up? Need I tell any of you that the bazars are open, and not only open but frequented on the part of those who wear the Christian name? Need I tell any of you that ship-building, and house-building, and house-repairing, and other kinds of handicraft are carried on just as openly, and almost as actively, as on other days? Need I tell any of you that orders are often issued for repairs to be executed on that day, that business may not be interrupted on any other day of the week? Need I tell any of you that visiting merely for purposes of frivolous ceremony prevails on that day, that the course is frequented for the evening drive even in cases where the excuse of feeble health cannot be pleaded, and that newspapers and works of amusement or of general literature are read by too many among us to the almost entire exclusion, it is to be feared, of the bible and of edifying manuals of piety and devotion?

These modes of sabbath profanation are well known; and by being constantly thrust upon the attention of professing christians, they tend in a direct though gradual and imperceptible manner to lead them to imbibe lax and unscriptural notions of the manner, in which the day ought to be observed. This is a sore evil—a serious obstacle to the progress of spiritual religion. The manner in which the Lord's day is kept in any place is, as all experience evinces, a tolerably correct index of the state of piety in that place, and wherever its holy rest is to a glaring extent not observed, there we are sure to find the tone of spirituality low and defective. It has, besides, been often remarked, that

religious declensions are in general first manifested by a less tender walk on that day, while a more earnest attention to the concerns of the soul is uniformly exhibited in the greater sanctity with which it is regarded and observed; and the people of God in every age have with one accord borne grateful testimony to the fact that the more carefully they remembered it to keep it holy, the more cordially they entered into its spirit, and the more religiously they devoted it to its appropriate uses, just the more largely were their souls refreshed with the streams of heavenly blessing, and the more vigorously did they advance in the path of holy attainment. It is clear from all this that the lax observance of the Lord's day is at once evil in its nature and evil in its results, and especially that it tends to exert a deadening influence on all around. Hear, then, my friends the Watchman's warning voice, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy!" Separate it—set it apart—keep it sacred to God. Never employ it in bringing up arrears of business, in posting your ledgers, or in writing your business letters; and regard every species of Sabbath-work as a form of Sabbath desecration. Learn to look upon that day as the Queen of days, the best of all the seven. Husband its sacred hours with jealous care, and prize it as the blessed season in which you may be lifted above the din, and distractions, and impurities of earth, and formed for habitual converse with spiritual and eternal realities. Thus feeling, and thus acting, you will enter into the design of the day of rest, enjoy its most precious blessings, and reap its choicest fruits. "For, thus saith the Lord, if thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable, and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thy own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words, then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord."

- (5.) There is still one other danger to which I must advert, though my remarks upon it shall be brief. It is connected with overlooking, or only faintly realizing the responsibility that attaches to all the professed followers of Christ, who live in the midst of a heathen population.

It is now, if I mistake not, generally admitted, that the intervention of Divine providence may be clearly traced in the extraordinary series of events by which India was subjugated to British rule, and not only so, but that God has placed under a high moral responsibility all to whom has been committed any part in the government of this vast empire. But how little do professing Christians either individually or collectively reflect upon God's design in bringing them into this heathen land, or seek to fulfil the work which He has given them to do in the midst of it! How seldom and how feebly do they realize the idea that here they sustain the high function of witnesses for God and God's truth, representatives of Christ's blessed gospel, protesters against every form of idolatrous worship, and pioneers in the way of Christian civilization! Nay how many among them are there, whose lives give the lie to their creed and prove a stumbling block to its propagation—how many on account of whom "the way of truth is evil spoken of" among the blinded idolaters, and bigoted unbelievers, and by whose means the labours of the most devoted Missionaries are in effect

neutralized—how many in regard to whom, and in reference to whose contempt of divine things and extreme habits of profligacy, even the heathen may take up this scoffing taunt “These are the people of the Lord that have gone forth of their own land!”

It is true there are very many amongst us of whom nothing like this can be alleged; yet, can it be affirmed of them, that they feel in any measure as Paul did, whose spirit was stirred within him, when he saw the city of Athens wholly given up to idolatry? Can it be affirmed of them that they mourn and lament on account of the abominations that are day by day wrought in this land of vile and polluting superstition—on account of the dishonour which is done to Jehovah's holy name, and the insults which are offered to His glorious majesty—and on account of the deep rooted, and wide-spread dominion of Satan, who may with lamentable appropriateness be said “here to have his seat?” Can it be affirmed of them that their spiritual sensibilities are painfully excited by the view of heathen men and heathen women living under their roof, that they long and pray for their conversion to the faith of Christ, and that they employ earnest and zealous endeavours to bring the knowledge of salvation within their reach? Ah! my friends, you know that this admits of being affirmed of few, of very few among us: you know that the responsibility that rests upon us in reference to the heathen among whom we dwell is to a sad, sad extent overlooked, and that the duties springing out of it are fearfully neglected! Now is this right? Can it be safe? Will not God judge us for these things? Has He not a controversy with us because of them? And may it not be on account of them, that His Spirit is so evidently restrained, and that so few tokens of His enriching blessing are discernible either in the several sections of the visible church, or over the whole field of Missionary enterprise?

Yes! the danger is real, and the evil is great. Hear, then, the Watchman's warning voice. Awake to a sense of the responsibility which you lie under, as residing in the midst of a heathen population. Be humbled on the review of your past carelessness and unprofitableness. Be stirred up to recognise, and seek to fulfil your long neglected duty. Think of the dishonor done to your God and Saviour. Think of the myriads of perishing sinners by whom you are surrounded. Lay yourselves out for their good both temporal and spiritual; pray without ceasing that the Spirit of the Lord may reclaim them from their soul-destroying errors, inform their minds with saving knowledge, and quicken them to newness of life; and study continually to exhibit to them in your daily walk a fair representation of Christ's Holy Gospel, to be unto them as His living epistles, and to “shine as lights among them holding forth the word of life.” And to incite you to the discharge of this duty, let these words of mingled warning and encouragement be ever sounding in your ears and ever present to your thoughts, “Them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.”

I have thus, my friends, endeavoured to answer the question contained in the text, when supposed to be put to me by one of your number—have pointed out, in other words, some of the things by which, as I conceive, your spiritual interests are peculiarly endangered.

Having already drawn so largely upon your attention I can scarcely venture to detain you with any concluding exhortations. Suffer me, however, to say to you, if the dangers which I have specified be real—if there be so many circumstances, connected with your situation in this land which are calculated to encumber, entangle, and retard you in running the Christian race, or even to divert you from the zealous prosecution of it—what need have you of vigilance and circumspection; how constantly ought you to maintain the posture of watchfulness and prayer lest ye enter into temptation; and above all, how fervently and unceasingly ought you to supplicate the aid of the Holy Spirit of promise, who alone can strengthen you with might in the inner man, lift you superior to all opposing obstacles, and conduct you with infallible certainty to the “end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls!” Yes! it is only by thus watching, and praying, and striving that you can escape all the ensnaring and adverse influences by which you are surrounded, and succeed in cultivating those graces and virtues which constitute Christian character. But how worthy of the most strenuous, self-denying, and sustained exertions are the high and holy objects which are proposed to you in the gospel! Compared with any of those earthly portions for which so much toil is cheerfully undergone, and so many privations are ungrudgingly endured, how transcendently glorious is the inheritance to which the aspirations and the hopes of believers in Christ Jesus are linked, and which awaits them as a sure reversion! All the objects which men prize so highly and pursue so unremittingly, even when they are realized—and how often alas! are they not realized!—are held by a most precarious tenure and sooner or later pass away from their grasp; and the very things, which in the prospect seemed to them so lovely and enchanting, not seldom prove in the experience worthless, and barren of enjoyment as the fabled apples of Sodom, which, though beautiful exceedingly to the eye, crumbled into ashes under the touch! The portion of the faithful, on the other hand, is certain, satisfying, indestructible, and abiding as heaven itself. Not all the force, not all the cunning, not all the malice, of those who are leagued against them as their adversaries, nor all the revolutions and changes which this fair scene of things is destined to undergo, can in the least degree affect the subliming prospects which it holds out to them, or prevent their ultimate realization. The noblest monuments of human art may crumble into ruins; all the glitter and the pomp of worldly magnificence may vanish like the figures of a distempered dream, and be as if they had never been; the heavens with all their gorgeous beauty may be folded up as a scroll; old ocean may heave with convulsions; and this earth may reel to its centre, and wrapt in one universal conflagration may dissolve, and leave not a vestige of its former being—but it will still subsist unchanged and unchangeable, unaffected by accidents, impregnable to the assaults of outward violence, and secured against internal decay! Oh! who would not watch, who would not strive, who would not endure for the sake of such a portion as this?

ILLUSTRATIVE INCIDENTS :

I. WHO WOULD NOT PRAY? II. WHO WOULD DELAY?

The following records are authentic. The incidents described in them are important, being illustrations of divine truth, and demonstrations of human duty. They are calculated to make the serious pause, and the foolish think: the former to pause and inquire, "What have I done for my neighbour? How easy it is to do good, if we will!"—the latter to think with concern, "What have I done for myself?—What if I should die as I have lived? Who can secure me repentance at last?"—The former incident illustrates the *sinner saved*—the latter illustrates the case of the *sinner (apparently) lost*—the former the blessedness of seeking God's Holy Spirit—the latter, the awful misery of sinning that Divine Person away: the former teaches the lesson, "*Who would not pray?*" the latter asks the solemn question, "*Who would delay?*"—The former shews us how merciful is God to man—the latter declares how unmerciful is man to himself.

We may further mention for satisfaction, that the former of these two records, has already been printed, although not in general circulation:—the latter record has been communicated in manuscript by the eye-witness of the painful incident referred to, a gentleman now resident in India.

The Lord grant his blessing with the *personal*!

J. M. D.

I.—WHO WOULD NOT PRAY?

"Behold! He prayeth!"

One Saturday evening in the autumn of 18—, a clergyman landed at Southampton, from the Cowes steam-packet. As the hour was late, he lost no time in inquiring for the public conveyances to Winchester; having engaged, on the following morning, to preach for a friend in that city. To his surprise and vexation, the London night coach was full; and although a stage would leave Southampton early in the morning, he was unwilling to

travel on the Sabbath, if by any means it could be avoided. After some consideration within himself, as to the best course to be pursued under these circumstances, he rang the bell for the waiter, and sent him for a gig.

In a short time the waiter re-appeared, and announced that the vehicle was at the door.—Accordingly the gentleman took his seat, and being very weary, wrapped his cloak round him, and leaned back to compose himself to a quiet nap. They had not, however, advanced far on the London road before this injunction of holy writ came powerfully on his mind, “Be instant in season and out of season.”

This clergyman was accompanied by a stranger, and that stranger his inferior; he would only be in his society a few hours that evening, and then, perhaps, might never meet him again.—Still, there was a low, inward voice whispering, “Be instant in season and out of season.” He might have thought that his proper season would be in the pulpit, on Sunday morning, for serving God and winning souls to salvation; but God knew that His work was not to be confined to the worship of a Sabbath morning; He knew that it might effectually be done in the journey of a Saturday night; and God, therefore, spoke quietly, yet forcibly, within His servant’s mind, “Be instant in season and out of season.” Accordingly the following conversation took place:—

“What is your name, my good friend?” “My name’s John Butler, Sir.”
 C. “Have you lived long at Southampton, Butler?” B. “Yes, Sir; I was born at Southampton, and never lived any where else, Sir.” C. “And have you always been in this business, that is, a driver?” B. “Yes, Sir; I was brought up in the stables.” C. “Did you ever go to school, Butler?” B. “Yes, Sir; my mother sent me to the charity school for a month or two; but I never took much to my book, and so she gave it up; and after that I went along with my father into the stables and helped him a little.” C. “I suppose, Butler, you often read the Bible at School?” B. “Why, Sir, I never learned enough to read much, and I quite forget what it was we used to read out of.” C. “But you have heard the Bible read in Church, of course. Did you ever read that book out of which the minister reads at church?” B. “I can’t say that I have, Sir; for I don’t often go there. I’ve too much to do for that. When a man has to get a bit of bread in these hard times, he has to work, Sir, every day, and all the day. Why, sir, I’m obliged to be out with my horse and chaise all day; though, to be sure, I can’t always get hired. Now, when I get back to-night, I shall just be able to rub down my horse and give a feed o’ corn, and then go to bed. And I must clean my harness and wash the chaise to-morrow; for perhaps somebody will want to go out with it, and I can’t take people out in a dirty chaise; they wouldn’t like it, you know, Sir.” C. “Of course not, Butler; but, you could leave the harness and chaise till Monday morning, and ———” B. “Oh no, Sir; that would be impossible. Why, what would the people say, if I should refuse to go out with them? They’d say they wouldn’t have me any more; and then, Sir, you know, I should lose all my custom; and what would become of my family then?” C. “You had better offend your customers, than break God’s commandment to ‘Keep holy the Sabbath-day, and do no work in it.’ But if you were to refuse those who came to hire you, and were to go to Church and learn to read your Bible, I am sure you would succeed much better in the week, and be a much happier man.” B. “Ah, Sir, it’s very easy to talk about being religious and all that; but when a man has, as I say, to get his bread in these hard times, he can’t keep at home o’ Sundays.” C. “But do you not know that you are sinning against God, and breaking one of His commandments

in taking no thought of his day, and neglecting his word? My good friend, you have a soul which must *very shortly* be either miserable for ever, or for ever happy; and, if you are not careful — Do you ever *pray* to God?" B. "Pray, Sir? I don't know how to pray, or what to pray for; not but what they used to tell me I ought to pray." C. "Suppose, now, I were to give you a prayer, would you always offer it?" B. "Really, Sir, I can't promise that; I've no time for saying prayers, Sir, I've always too much to do." C. "Oh, yes, you can; the prayer I shall give you you can say at all times. When you're in the stable cleaning and feeding your horses; when you're waiting to be hired, and even when you're driving along the road you can pray the prayer I shall teach you." B. "Well Sir, I can't recollect prayers; I never had a wonderful memory. I'm sure, Sir, I shan't be able to say this prayer you talk about." C. "Oh, yes, you will; for I shall give you a very short prayer. There are only twelve words in it. 'O Lord God, for Jesus Christ's sake, grant me thy Holy Spirit.'" B. "Well, Sir, that's short enough, to be sure. Let me see what it is; Sir?" C. "I shall divide it into three parts for you. Now say it after me. 'O Lord God.'" B. "O Lord God." C. "For Jesus Christ's sake." B. "For Jesus Christ's sake." C. "Grant me thy Holy Spirit." B. "Grant me thy Holy Spirit." C. "Now try if you can say the whole." B. "O Lord God, for Jesus Christ's sake, grant me thy Holy Spirit." C. "Now do you know for what you are to pray? You are to say, 'O Lord God,' because He made you, and gives you daily your food and clothes, and keeps you alive. If He choose, He could this instant take away your breath, and then you would immediately die. And He can make you happy, and deserves that you should love Him, and has a right to your obedience. He will not only take care of your body, but will take care also of your soul, and because He loves your soul has written the Bible, that you might know what to do to be quite happy in this world and the next." B. "Was the Bible then written, Sir, to make us happy? I'm sure, Sir, I didn't know that." C. "Yes, Butler, it certainly was; and the ten commandments, if you were to obey them, would make you perfectly happy." B. "Ah, Sir, them ten commandments, I've not obeyed them, you say, and I'm sure, Sir, no one ever could do all they bid us to do. Now, I've heard one of those people who go to church always, and read their Bible, and make a great many prayers, say, that if we should only *wish* to do wrong, we have broken the commandments. Why, Sir, it is impossible to keep them so." C. "The person who told you that, was quite right; and if you pray as I tell you, you will find that she is quite right." B. "Then I can't see how we're to be saved, Sir." C. "When God saw that man could not keep the commandment, He sent Christ into the world that men might be saved, not by the works of the law, for if we offend but in one point we are guilty of all; and though we may think that we keep that law, and obey it perfectly, what is our obedience—our fancied righteousness—in the sight of a pure and holy God? Verily, nothing better than, as the Bible tells us, filthy rags. How, then, can we be saved? Not by the works of the law, but by faith in Christ—by believing on Him—coming to Him; for Christ died on the cross to save sinners; and if *we* believe on Him, *we* shall be saved. I wish you also to ask God for the Holy Spirit, because this Holy Spirit will teach you of Christ, and will show you how sinful you have been, and how necessary it is that you should flee to the cross of Christ for salvation; for, remember, by Christ alone can we poor sinners be saved. 'There is none other name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus.'—This Holy Spirit too, will help you to do what is good; for, as I have told you, we are by nature so sinful that we can of ourselves do nothing good; it will also make you love your Bible, love prayer, and love all that's good." B. "Well, Sir, and why do you say,

'For Jesus Christ's sake !' " C. " Because Jesus Christ told his disciples before he left this world, ' Whosoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, believing, ye shall receive.' God was displeased and angry with men on account of their sins; so much so, that 'no man can come unto Him but by Christ.' Christ is our Friend, and He is God's Son; if, therefore, we ask God in the name of His Son, He will, out of love to His Son, grant us that which we ask Him for." B. "I'm very much obliged to you, Sir, and shall try to say this prayer over and over again, as often as I think of it."

Having thus, in a great measure, satisfied his conscience, the Clergyman leaned back in the gig, and prayed earnestly that the seed he had been scattering in the heart of his companion might take deep root there, and bring forth abundant fruit to the glory of our Redeemer, and the salvation of an immortal soul. He knew that there lay in the path ten thousand obstacles—long and fixed habits of sin, utter darkness, and the society of evil and ungodly men; but he knew that God's power had converted Paul from being a persecutor of the church, to one of its boldest and most zealous defenders; and he had himself experienced the same power in changing his own heart; and giving to him a love of Christ and repentance for sins, and a desire of holiness, when he was a careless, indifferent, and scoffing sinner. Besides God's promise had been given, and His attribute was Truth, and His nature was unchangeable. He besought Him, therefore by His own name, for His own Son's sake, in fulfilment of His promise, that this poor man's prayer might be answered; though he offered it almost in ignorance of the purport of its language; that He who hath not called the wise and the noble and the mighty to exemplify His glory, and make known His power, would now take a mean creature, full of darkness and full of sin, and make him a monument of his mercy, and a vessel for His praise. In these prayerful meditations, this watchful servant of our Lord passed the rest of his journey, which, though short, had been fraught with so much and deep interest. He well knew that a Paul might plant, and an Apollos water in vain, without the blessing of the Great Husbandman; but he knew also, that this blessing would not be withheld to the faithful servant who scattered the seed in faith and hope. Might not his heart, too, have been animated when the cheering promise recurred, "He that watereth shall be watered himself;" and when his mind glanced through the vista of time to the now glorious fulfilment of it in a happy eternity, where "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars, for ever and ever."

Thus musing, they entered the city of Winchester, when John suddenly said, "Do you know, Sir, that prayer you gave me I've been saying a great many times, and I've got it now quite perfect, and, Sir, I've been determining in my own mind, Sir, to say it as often as I can."

C. "I'm glad to hear you say so, John; and I have been praying for you that you may do so, and that God will hearken to your petition, and give that which will make you a more useful, a happier, and a better man. He will not forget you, John, if you do not forget Him. May He bless you!"

With these words they parted; and the blessing followed him on whom it was invoked, as we shall discover by the sequel of our story.

Several years had passed since the night in which the conversation I have related took place, when the Clergyman before mentioned had occasion once more to visit Southampton. Passing through one of the bye-streets, he saw written in large letters over the door of a neat-looking house, "John Butler, licensed to let out gigs, chaises, and saddle horses, on hire."

The conversation he had held with the driver, on the Winchester road, suddenly crossed his mind ; and wondering whether this could be the same individual, he walked up to the house, and tapping at the door, inquired of a plainly-dressed but respectably-looking woman, for John Butler.

"He is not at home, Sir, but I think he may be in the stables. Johnnay, go and see if your father's in the stable, and tell him a gentleman wants to speak to him directly ; make haste, now, as fast as you can."

The little boy was just running out, in obedience to his mother's order, when John Butler came in ; and, gazing for a moment on the stranger, he then rushed forward, and seizing both his hands with most affectionate earnestness, exclaimed, "God bless you, Sir, arn't you the gentleman I drove over to Winchester, some time ago ?—You taught me, Sir, that short, but blessed prayer—'O Lord God, for Jesus Christ's sake, grant me thy Holy Spirit.'"

The Clergyman answered him, "Yes, John, I am ; and I hope you found that all I said was good, and all I foretold was true." B. "Oh, yes ; the Lord bless you ! I have, through the grace of God. I'm now a happy man, Sir, and all my family, thank God, are happy too ; and all through that good advice you gave me, and the prayer you taught me."

C. "Well, I'm glad of that. How did you first become really serious—when, that is, did you begin to *enjoy* religion ?" B. "You shall hear all about it.—I used to say this prayer over very often to myself, and add it as you told me, while I was at work, and at all sorts of times, Sir. And so I went on for some time, till one Sunday it happened I wasn't hired, and I was loitering near the church, and so, as I had nothing to do, I thought I would just go in and see what was a-going on ; and the prayers, Sir, were just over, so the minister took his text, 'The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin.' And then, Sir, he proved to me how great a sinner I was, and that if I wasn't washed clean in Christ's blood, I never could be saved : and I began to think a good deal about my soul then, Sir, and so, next Sunday I went again, and persuaded my wife to go, too ; and ever since then we went always, Sir, and I never afterwards went out on a Sunday with any one ; never found that I *wanted* bread or clothes, and my wife will tell you how happy we have been ever since ; and we always read a Bible which we have bought, and pray every night with our dear children, and God has indeed blessed us, Sir." Then his wife joined with him in thanking the Clergyman for his precious advice, and the sweet little prayer he had given her dear husband.

The Clergyman blessed God for His faithfulness, and thanked Him for his merrcy, as the happy little family knelt around him while he supplicated a throne of grace on their behalf ere they parted.

Reader, pray this prayer ; and may God grant you an answer for the sake of our Redeemer Jesus Christ !

"Pray without ceasing!"

Prayer was appointed to convey
The blessings God designs to give ;
Long as they live should Christians pray,
For only while they pray they live.

The Christian's heart his prayer indicates,
He speaks as prompted from within ;
The Spirit his petitions writes,
And Christ receives and gives it in.

And shall we then in silence lie,
 When Christ stands waiting for our prayer ?
 My soul ! thou hast a friend on high,
 Arise, and try thy interest there !

If pain afflict, or wrong oppress,
 If cares distract, or fears dismay,
 If guilt deject, if sin distress,
 The remedy's before thee ;—*Pray !*

Depend on Christ—thou canst not fail ;
 Make all thy wants and wishes known ;
 Fear not—His merits must prevail ;
 Ask what thou wilt, it shall be done !

II.—WHO WOULD DELAY ?

" Man giveth up the ghost, and where is he ?"

Some years ago I knew a very handsome accomplished lady, under thirty, and who had been for some years married. She had resided above two years in India ; but being tired of this sultry climate, and having an ample private fortune of her own, she persuaded her husband to quit India, that they might go home and enjoy themselves in a more genial clime.

I sailed in the same ship with them from one of the Indian ports to London.

This lady was a very gay person, as was also her husband ; indeed their general deportment, and especially their desecration of the holy Sabbath, grieved me sadly. I often heard her play the guitar and sing most exquisitely, but had little reason to suppose that any of her songs were sacred melodies. How noble, and how sweet is music, when used to set forth the praises of our kind Creator and Redeemer, of Him who planteth the ear and giveth to music all its charms ! and even profane music, as it is called, which treats of secular subjects, may be good, where that gracious God is not forgotten or insulted.

Novels of every kind were the favorite reading of this lady—dreams of earth !—while *that* Book which points out man's duty to God and his prospects, either of misery or of happiness beyond the grave, seemed wholly forgotten.

We approached the Cape, but did not touch there ; for we passed on—in the month of August. At that season a north-west wind blows for weeks with a hurricane's violence, raising the billows mountains high—so that the homeward bound ship sometimes advances only two hundred miles in a whole fortnight : she carries only one or two small sails, more to keep the ship steady than with any hope of making progress ; while all the main deck, and even the poop deck, is soaked by the spray or the waves.

On the 6th August, before the wind and waves had begun to run so high, the husband surprised me by rushing into my cabin, and before he could explain his errand, bursting into tears. His lady had for some weeks been poorly ; and now he informed me that her mind was affected—that her memory seemed to fail her, for she asked the same question twenty times over—and she eagerly inquired where she was, and whither she was going.

On the 8th, she sent for me, and when I came to her couch she said she feared she was dying, and wished to know what she must do to be saved.

I told her, as clearly as I could, of a perfect Saviour, and a willing God—while she repeated every sentence, as well as her own questions, upon her fingers, so as best to understand and remember what was said. She insisted however, that for her there was no hope; that she must go to hell for ever. This she said rather carelessly, either because she neither understood, nor really believed, what she affected to say, or because her mind was then very weak. At last I left her for a time. In the evening I saw her again, and was glad to find that the loss of memory and confusion of ideas had left her, so that she was now quite rational. She said nothing whatever about religion, but a great deal about other things. I was afraid to introduce the unwelcome subject, lest I should occasion mental excitement and aggravate her complaint.

On Sunday the 9th, I conversed with her. She listened to what I said about sin and salvation, but she said she had committed the unpardonable sin, and that for her there was no hope. I prayed with her, and for her, to God the Saviour, the husband kneeling with us;—but she did not appear to benefit by my efforts, for she either talked of her being a tolerably good person, or gave way to a deep despair which would believe no good news of pardon or of grace.

I shall never forget that Sunday evening! It was a dark night, and the north-wester was blowing with a tempest's fury, roaring through the rigging and tossing the ship with such violent jerks that it was most difficult either to stand or sit or lie. I was summoned to her cabin—she lay on her couch while I tried to assure her that the almighty God who presides in the storm is also the willing Saviour of the penitent who believes in Jesus:—but, she would hear only to gainsay, and disbelieve, and despair. At length she started up on her couch and with her long black hair hanging down her neck she wildly screamed out, pointing to the stern cabin windows, that she was now in HELL—and she cried out, "Oh, THE DEVIL! THE DEVIL!" The husband grasped his beloved wife and kissed and shook her, saying "Mary, Mary;" and the while the nurse held her, he kneeled down and cried to God "Oh have mercy on my Mary!"

By and bye she grew calm.—I have nothing more that is terrible to describe.—On the Monday I went and sat by her while the husband was dining, and the nurse was with us. She was now gentle, playful and affectionate, but quite crazed, for she fondly passed her fingers through my hair and said many strange things, and spoke of many persons and scenes with which I was wholly unacquainted.

On Sunday morning, the 23rd August, she died. In her lucid intervals when she had any, worldly, not religious, matters were ever on her lips; for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh—or was it to be expected that one, who when in the full enjoyment of health and understanding had wholly forgotten and put far away from her the things that concerned her everlasting peace, would easily or willingly give heed to them when reason was almost gone. It is not to be wondered at if God sometimes causes those who long mispend their reason and their affections upon 'earthly things,' to spend their last days bereft of reason.

That Sunday there was a calm; and in the evening the funeral service was read and the dead committed to the deep, amid the beauty and sublimity of grand ocean scenery:—the evening was beautiful, after so many days and nights of clouds and storms; but in a few hours the hurricane again blew, and for days we were tossed about as before.

I presume not to decide what was the subsequent condition of this poor lady's soul, or where she is now.—Erase her name from her a solemn reality!

—and were she even in heaven, she would now entreat all her sisters on this earth to become “wise unto salvation” and that *immediately*, WITHOUT DELAY! — G.

“Hear, and your soul shall live!” What you *are* is what the gospel respects in you; what you *need* is what the gospel offers:—to wait, therefore, on the plea of not being good enough, and of wishing first to become better, is self-deceit, and a lie against the gospel. The best work you can now perform is to believe now, and to turn now; and, without this, all intended preparation is but condemnation. Nay, so far from gaining or becoming better by delay, you lose and become worse. Your heart becomes harder, your mind darker, your sin greater, your time shorter, your burden heavier, your love less, your terror more, heaven further, hell nearer, God more angry, the Spirit more grieved, the Saviour more dimly seen, the gospel more powerless, ministers more faint, friends more despondent, prayer less importunate, providence more unfelt, the world stronger, the flesh sweeter, Satan mightier, and the drowsy slumber of the second and eternal death, now at hand, more frequent and irresistible! Then shall that word be fulfilled, it may be—“I will laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh upon you! Ye shall call unto me, but I will not answer!” Reader! is that meant for you? What know you but it may?

Arise, flee—the way is before thee—hold on straight, but make speed. —haste thee, haste thee! Behold that Throne of Grace. Behold that Mediator with the blood of sprinkling before it. See, He is an Advocate—an Intercessor for transgressors; go up to Him now in thine heart—put the catalogue of sin into His hand:—see how He smiles over thee with love inexpressible!—Receive the sprinkling of His blood on thy conscience. Now lift up thine eyes. He who sitteth on that Throne unseen, is the eternal Father! He who led thee to this Throne, is the blessed Spirit, the Comforter! He who now holds thee with a kinsman’s hand before the throne is Jesus, the Saviour! and that blessing which is now issuing from the Throne, is free, full, present, and everlasting salvation by Him!” Behold, “JESUS CHRIST is able to save unto the uttermost (or evermore) them that come unto God by Him; seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them!” The Lord save thee, my reader!

THE
CAUSE OF CHRIST
AND
THE CAUSE OF SATAN.

THE
CAUSE OF CHRIST

AND
THE CAUSE OF SATAN ;

OR, .

THE HOPES AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE RIGHTEOUS
AND THE WICKED ,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE
DEFEATS AND TRIUMPHS THAT SIGNALIZE THE HISTORY
OF REDEMPTION

A DISCOURSE OR ADDRESS DELIVERED ON SUNDAY, 13TH AUGUST, BY THE
REV. DR. DUFF, AT THE FIRST MEETING FOR PUBLIC WORSHIP,
IN CONNECTION WITH THE FREE PROTESTING
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, CALCUTTA.

CALCUTTA :

PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, CIRCULAR ROAD.

1843.

THE

CAUSE OF CHRIST AND THE CAUSE OF SATAN.

"The hope of the righteous shall be gladness; but the expectation of the wicked shall perish."—*Proverbs* v. 28.

I address myself to the feelings of many here present, when I say, that there exists the desire and the hope of once more re-visiting their native land. Apart, altogether, from recollections of the olden time, which serve to enshrine it in the memory, as the land of noble thought and noble daring—the land where, pre-eminently, were fought the battles of civil right and religious liberty—it has other and peculiar claims that tend to embalm it in the affections of the heart. It is the cradle of their infant days, the nursery of their youthful imaginings:—and with it are linked the fondnesses of parental love—the endearments of family ties—the sympathies of generous friendship—and all the numberless and nameless associations that belong to the emphatic word, "home."

Now, the fancy may be a singular one.—It may even be allowed to exceed the bounds of what is probable, or possible—and yet, for the sake of illustration, I feel strongly prompted to give it expression.

Suppose, then, that as in times past, so now, small groups of homeward voyagers ever and anon leave these shores—flushed with joy, and buoyant with the hope of soon mingling with those scenes, that witnessed the pastimes of youth, and are still hallowed by the presence of beloved friends. Suppose that, on reaching a certain line on the ocean, every company in succession, and without any exception, becomes suddenly affected in new and unwonted ways. Suppose that all, both passengers and crew, have the whole frame and disposition of their minds strangely modified and changed. Suppose that, by the spell of some potent enchanter, or other hidden and mysterious influence, all their remembrances of the past are obliterated; all their plans, designs, and intentions for the future, wholly effaced; and amid this total wreck, alike of the past and the future, nought is left to the unhappy men, but the consciousness of the passing present. It is easy to perceive that, in such a case, further progress in the voyage, and further advance in the course originally prescribed, would be at an end. You next behold the little communities of every vessel, variously inclined, and variously occupied:—some employed in gilding and garnishing their floating tenements; others, in fashioning and refashioning ornaments and robes for the body:—some engaged in pursuing or watching the movements of the tenants of the deep; and others, gliding indolently and carelessly along as winds or currents may direct:—some moored by a foreign strand, idly gazing at the heavens or musing and meditating what may be their origin and destiny; and others, propelled

by more active instincts, tracing the windings of the neighbouring shore, or wandering by the river's bank; or gathering the fruit from every tree, or cropping the beauties of every flower, or gaily basking on some sunny bank. But enough.—Who could behold such a spectacle—a spectacle of such pleasing illusion and fascinating delirium,—without shedding the tears of commiseration over the unhappy beings, who, in all their dreams, never once dream of home, or of the anxious dwellers there, that wonder, and still wonder on, at the *long, long* delay? And, who would not pray, if prayer could aught avail, that some mightier Power might arise, who would dissolve the spell, and dissipate the enchantment, and restore these wanderers to the wonted exercise of reason and memory—to the joys of their native land—to the bosom of their kindred and their friends?

Behold in this, a picture—a melancholy, though alas, a faint and feeble picture indeed—of human beings in their natural condition.

Time was, when man set off in the bark of life, to cross the ocean of time, and thus reach his real, his native, home, in the climes of immortality. But the Eternal Architect had drawn a clear and well defined and unalterable line between the region of right and wrong—of obedience and disobedience—of loyalty and rebellion. And man, in his progress heavenward, actuated by infernal agency, approached this line—heedlessly crossed it—and thus at once entered the territory of disloyalty, misery, and death. Instantly did sin, the mighty enchanter, seize him. And never did the fabled spell of the magician operate with more sudden—more deadly potency. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, it subverted the whole fabric of the soul; it unhinged the higher faculties; it transformed the affections into base desires and unholy feelings and sensuous cravings. And in the thick-ness of the gloom that enveloped him, man, wretched man, sunk into dismal ignorance and hopeless unconcern, regarding his heavenly origin and immortal destinies. And all men, throughout the successive periods of time, have continued in a state of oblivious delusion, as to whence they are, and whither they are going. Forgetful of their Father; forgetful of their everlasting home; forgetful of the fellowship and sweet society of kindred spirits that ever shine in the presence of Jehovah, and partake of his ineffable joy:—the miserable race of Adam have contentedly settled down on this earth—this far distant land—as if it were heaven, their abiding dwelling-place. And under the influence of a universal and insatiating blindness, they have resorted to a thousand expedients to drown the soul in still deeper forgetfulness. They have grasped at golden fruits, and found them smoke and ashes. They have clasped gorgeous phantoms, and found them air. They have embraced alluring forms, and found them empty shades. They have pursued musings and meditations, and found them waking dreams. And still they dream of—things impossible,—

Of joys perpetual in perpetual change!

Of stable pleasures on the tossing wave!

Eternal sunshine in the storms of life!

Such is the condition of all mankind by nature. But, blessed be God, who in compassion left it not so; but sent forth the Son of his

eternal love, to seek and to save the lost. He, a mightier Potentate than sin, or death, or hell, entered this land of apparitions and empty shades—this vast lazar-house and funereal vault—and, at the expense of tears and agonies and blood, he reared a solid pathway across the gloom, and opened the gates of righteousness, by which poor deluded sinners might enter in.

Now, all they who have listened to his invitations—all they, whose eyes have been opened spiritually to see—all they, whose hard hearts have been touched spiritually to feel—all they, who have entered the strait gate, and trodden the narrow way, as travellers towards Zion;—these, and these alone are the people, who in my text are designated *righteous*, and of whose *hope* it is divinely predicated that, whatever clouds and darkness may intervene, it shall ever issue in *gladness*.

All they, on the other hand, who remain unmoved, and turn a deaf ear to the call, and refuse to come to the light because their deeds are evil; all they who resolve, rather to pursue “the mere whispers of fancy and the mere phantoms of hope;” all they who remain the servants of Satan, the drudges of sin, and the heirs of perdition—preferring the empty honours and fading pleasures of time, to the substantial rewards and never-ending joys of eternity;—these, under whatever name they may be known among men—whatever be their amiability of character or standard of moral virtue—whatever be their rank, station, influence, or power in the conventional arrangements or courtesies of worldly society;—these,—these are the people, who, in my text, are denominated *wicked*, and of whose *expectation* it is unequivocally declared, that, whatever be its gleams of sunshine and radiancy, it shall, in the end, utterly *perish*.

On an ordinary occasion, it would now be my endeavour to proceed *practically* to illustrate both those great truths, as they concern the *righteous* and the *wicked*—*personally* and *individually*. And a more copious or profitable theme could scarcely be found, than that which would set forth, how all the individual hopes of the *righteous*, *as such*, must issue in gladness in this life, in gladness at the hour of death, and in eternal gladness in the abodes of the blessed;—and how, on the other hand, all the individual expectations of the *wicked*, *as such*, must perish in this life, perish at the hour of death, and perish for ever in the abodes of the reprobate. But, the peculiarity of the occasion, on which we are assembled, suggests rather that for the present I should dispense with the consideration of the *practical*, the *personal*, the individual hopes and expectations of the *righteous* and the *wicked*, and apply the words of my text—by way of *natural* and *obvious* accommodation—to the great cause, in which the hopes and expectations of these classes, respectively, are ever most closely and inseparably bound up.

Let us then notice the words of the text as they are applicable to the cause which the *righteous* and the *wicked* have most at heart—the cause which most influentially excites and engrosses their *expectations* and their *hopes*—the cause, in whose present and final defeat or success, they are most deeply interested.

There are in the world, and, so far as we know, in the moral universe of God, but two great generic causes. There is the cause of truth and the cause of error—the cause of sin and the cause of righteousness—the cause of Christ and the cause of Satan. The cause of Christ is the cause of truth—the cause of righteousness—the cause of God, of holy angels, and of righteous men. The cause of Satan is the cause of error—the cause of sin—the cause of fallen angels and of wicked men.

Now the grand central point or principle—the ultimate triumph of which constitutes the hope of the righteous, which shall issue in gladness—and the ultimate defeat of which constitutes the expectation of the wicked which shall perish—is the exclusive supremacy of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the anointed Head of the Mediatorial kingdom, in all his high offices as *Prophet, Priest, and King*. The great Chief of the antagonism to this supremacy, which truly involves all the great doctrines wrapped up in the economy and covenant of Redemption, is Satan, the rebel leader of the fallen angels. From certain hints and notices in Scripture, the Christian author of the greatest of uninspired songs, not unhappily or inaptly, perhaps, supposes that this antagonism began in heaven. When “as yet this world was not, and chaos wild reigned where these heavens now roll,”—the angelic hosts are represented as assembling “under their hierarchs in order bright.” It was a day of high solemnity. For then the Eternal Son, who, by the Father infinite, sat in bliss embosomed, was first revealed and manifested, in his new vicergerent character, as King Messiah. The arch-apostate, with his hapless crew, filled with grief and envy, scorned to bow the knee, or do homage unto Him, in this newly assumed and officially constituted Headship over thrones and dominions, principalities and powers; and impiously revolted against the Lord and his Anointed. For a time, the cause of the newly inaugurated Messiah, which was equally the cause of the Triune Jehovah, in whose unfathomable counsels the economy of redemption originated, was left to be contested between the Potentates of light and the Potentates of darkness. At length, forth rushed “the chariot of Paternal Deity,” bearing “the Filial Godhead.” With his countenance changed into terror, and grasping in his right hand ten thousand thunders, he smote and overwhelmed the hosts of the rebellious. Take your stand, then, on the battlements of heaven—and look on this side, and on that. Behold the myriads of proud, aspiring, apostate spirits—erewhile flushed with mightiest expectation to seize the crown and monarchy of heaven—hurled “flaming from the ethereal sky,” scathed and blasted by the Almighty’s thunder. Behold, on the other hand, myriads of loyal and righteous spirits, who, animated with hope, had stood as eye-witnesses of the Messiah’s almighty acts, advancing with jubilee,—singing of triumph,—and, with loud hosannas, filling the eternal regions!—And then say, how sublimely true the announcement of my text,—“that the hope of the righteous shall be gladness; but the expectation of the wicked shall perish.”

But, leaving ground which at best can only be regarded as conjectural or allegorical—however interesting as designed to carry us up to the very source and origin of evil in the universe—let us direct our at-

tention to the sure utterances of Jehovah's infallible oracles. There, we learn of a truth that there were angels who sinned, and "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation." But, though rooted out of heaven, the accursed fallen were not annihilated. Licence being granted for a season, the Archangel ruined, bent on desperate and fiendish ends, reached the happy homes of Paradise. Alas! alas! of him it might truly be said, that, "he came—he saw—he conquered." Our great progenitors, caught by his malignant guile, fell from their allegiance to the Highest; and thus brought death into the world and all our woe. Speedily Messiah—the Angel of the covenant—the King of glory—appears. On our grand Foe, the sentence of final irretrievable destruction is passed; but its execution is delayed. The mighty struggle for supremacy is, accordingly, renewed—the scene only being transferred from heaven to earth—and new actors summoned to share in the honours and defeats of the fearful conflict. Eternal enmity is declared between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. In other words, the righteous—the elect and chosen out of all kindreds and nations—aided and cheered by ministering spirits, are to wage an unrelenting warfare with the wicked—the abandoned, the reprobate of all the families of the earth—aided and abetted by hellish fiends. The central point or principle of the contest was still the same, viz. the supremacy of the Messiah, not only as the Head of all creation, visible and invisible—the sovereign Lord of angels, of devils, and of men—but, especially, as Head of his own redeemed and ransomed ones, snatched as brands from the burning, by the interposition of his own almighty arm. Already, have been realized many pledges—many earnest—of the final victory of Messiah and his saints. Already, has the mighty principle come forth unscathed on the wing of many a triumph. It escaped uninjured from the giant rage of ante-diluvian wickedness; and its blazing torch crossed, unquenched and undimmed, the waters of the universal deluge. From the summits of Ararat, after centuries of scorn and reproach, insult and obloquy, ignominy and shame, behold righteous Noah, triumphant and safe, looking down on the wretched remains of the proudly wicked, blended and intermingled in indiscriminate confusion, with the wreck and ruin of the material world, and say, with what emphasis might he realize the language of my text—that "the hope of the righteous shall be gladness; but the expectation of the wicked shall perish."

The great principle now entered into fresh contests—contests ever varied, ever new. Still, amid lights and shadows, sunshine and darkness, it ultimately prevailed. It survived the rout and dispersion of the impious conspiracy of Babel-builders. It came forth with Abraham, pure and unalloyed, from the "falsities and lies" wherewith blinded nations were—

"Corrupted to forsake

God, their Creator—

And devils to adore for deities"—

It escaped, untainted, with righteous Lot, from the horrible and nameless pollutions of Sodom, and witnessed the wicked cities of the plain overwhelmed with fire and brimstone from heaven. It went down with

Joseph into Egypt, the cradle of superstition and the mother of idols. It there survived the grinding bondage of four hundred years; outlived the exterminating cruelties of the tyrannous Pharaoh—the great dragon in the midst of the waters;—and on the shores of the Red Sea, which witnessed the disastrous overthrow of the royal persecutor with all his chivalry, how truly might the chorus of the song of triumph be—that “the hope of the righteous shall be gladness; but the expectation of the wicked shall perish.”

Onwards, the principle had still to maintain a deadly conflict and struggle with the powers and emissaries of darkness. But it still prevailed. It survived the murmurings of Meribah—the idolatries of Sinai—the provocations of the wilderness—the wanton rites and “lustful orgies” of Shittim. It survived alike the backslidings of professed friends and the ragings of avowed foes—the judicial plagues, and pestilences, and captivities of a thousand years. In the person of the great Messiah himself, become incarnate, it withstood the desperate assaults of the desert, the temple-pinnacle, and the exceeding high mountain. It outlived the groans and ories of Gethsemane—the unparalleled agonies of Calvary—the ineffable dishonours of death and the grave. And when He,—over whose apparent downfall, the quaking earth and the rending rocks, and the sun shrouded in blackness, gave signs of anguish and of woe,—re-appeared among the sorrowing disciples—re-assured their drooping hearts—and, before their very eyes, re-ascended up on high, leading captivity captive, and leaving behind him the precious and soul-inspiring testimony, that He would come again in power and great glory, attended with all the pomp and equipage and retinue of manifested deity;—Oh, with what glowing ardour might they take up the words of my text, as their anthem of praise—that “the hope of the righteous shall be gladness; but the expectation of the wicked shall perish.”

But the signal of victory was only the signal for renewed warfare, of a fiercer and more extended character than ever. The Apostles, divinely invigorated and refreshed by converse with their risen and victorious Lord, and wondrously replenished with the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, sallied forth with the might of an indomitable energy, for the spiritual conquest of the nations. Their great commission being, “to teach and preach the gospel to every creature,” they bore witness to *all* truth—but the topmost flower in the garland of their testimony was—that Jesus of Nazareth is *the* prophet—the heavenly teacher—the Word of God—the revealer of the divine counsels—the preacher of glad tidings to the Gentiles—the light of the world. Rapid, and mighty, and beneficent was their march and progress, through all lands; but terrible, beyond all former precedent, was the opposition encountered. From the votaries of a proud philosophy,—from a despotic magistracy, a domineering priesthood, and an outrageous populace—proceeded trials and sufferings, calamities and deaths—in number and intensity such as the world had never previously beheld. After a succession of ten great persecutions, each rendered more memorable than the preceding, by the greater ingenuity of its hellishly devised methods of torture, and the greater variety of its barbaric cruelties—the very

recital of which even now would harrow up the soul with astonishment and horror—the saints of the Most High were almost worn out, and to the eye of sense all but exterminated. The persecutors, in their hour of exultation, struck a memorial of their fancied triumph—which still remains bearing this baneful inscription—“The name of Christians being extinguished.” And the very souls of the redeemed in glory are represented in Apocalyptic vision, as crying out from under the altar, “How long, O Lord, holy and true, wilt thou not avenge the blood of thy saints upon the earth?”—“Tis done.—The hour of man’s extremity has ever been that of God’s opportunity. The prophetic seer, in vision, “beheld, and lo, there was a great earthquake,”—an extraordinary revolution in the civil and religious state of the world—attended with a concussion or shaking in the heavens or firmament of power, and the earth or teeming masses of the subject people. The possessor of the Imperial throne bowed at the foot of the cross. Amidst horror and consternation the Pagan luminaries fell; even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind. “The great lights of the heathen world, the sun, moon, and stars”—as a faithful interpreter hath represented it—i. e. “the powers ecclesiastical and civil, were all eclipsed and obscured; the heathen emperors and Cæsars were slain; the heathen priests and augurs were extirpated; the heathen officers and magistrates were removed; and the heathen temples were demolished.” Who can compare the woes and calamities, the vexation and distress, the torments and the deaths,—yea, and the almost total despair and threatened annihilation of three centuries of incessant and savage persecution—with the sudden, unexpected, and universal triumph and repose that followed,—accompanied with songs of praise from the shattered but faithful witnesses of every kindred and tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation—songs of praise and joyous melody, rapturously re-echoed by the spirits of the redeemed in heaven,—without finding a new and glorious verification of the words of the text—that “the hope of the righteous shall be gladness; but the expectation of the wicked shall perish.”

But, earth is not designed to be the place of permanent repose to God’s own people. No; the sabbatism—the unbroken rest—that remaineth for them is reserved for a more genial soil and a kinder atmosphere. Earth is but the nursery, in which, amid sunshine and storm, those plants or renown are reared that are destined to bloom and blossom and bear fruit in the regions of immortality. Scarcely had the Pagan Anti-christ been slain, when the Papal Anti-christ—*emphatically styled, the Apostacy—the man of sin—the Son of perdition*—began to develope itself. Obscuring every known truth, and patronizing every conceivable error—it specially levelled its deadliest shafts at the prerogatives of the Divine Saviour as the great and sole High Priest of his people, whom he hath redeemed by the atoning and all-perfect sacrifice of himself upon the cross—multiplying mediators without end—converting simple ministers into Lordly tyrants—and both, into blaspheming priests. Throughout the period of a thousand years the faithful remnant in every land, who alone had the true Apostolic succession of grace and truth, continued,

amid obloquy, and reproach, and suffering unto death, to bear noble though mostly passive testimony to the priestly office of the Divine Redeemer, as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,—the one true Mediator—the one great High Priest of our profession—the one sole and all-sufficient sacrifice for transgression. Then sounded the trumpet of the Reformation. All Europe awoke from its guilty slumbers. Every empire, kingdom, and principality in Christendom lifted up an intrepid and active testimony to all the offices of the Redeemer, as the *sole prophet, priest, and king* of his people. Mighty and vehement, beyond all past example, were the wrestlings and contendings of the champions of the faith. Of these every region and clime and element can bear witness. Witness, ye Alpine wilds and deep embosomed valleys, how the bones of the faithful were scattered to be bound in the winter's frost, or scorched in the summer's sun ! Witness, ye Bohemian and Gallic plains, that have been enriched with the trodden dust of innumerable saints, who counted not their lives dear unto the death ! Witness, ye caves and dens of the earth, ye fastnesses of the mountain and the desert, that sheltered the wandering exiles from the wrath of hell's infuriated myrmidons ! Witness, ye dungeons of a merciless despotism and infernal inquisition, on whose sanguinary altars have perished whole hecatombs of innocents ! Witness, ye stakes, that have illumined every land with the fires,—and ye scaffolds, that have drenched every shore with the blood—of ten thousand thousand martyrdoms ! Witness, ye myriads, out of great tribulation whose robes do shine so bright, and whose blood still cries from under the altar for vengeance against the enemies of truth, and the Redeemer's kingly crown ! Witness Earth, witness Heaven, witness Hell !—how fell, how deadly, how protracted, how terrific was the contest !—But enough.—The contest is ended. In many a land, the oppressed and vilified truth is gloriously triumphant—and the faithful witnesses joyously reap the fruits of victory. The Reformed or Primitive or Apostolic faith is ratified and established. And when in our own, above all other lands, Kings and Princes and Nobles, Senators and Judges and the multitudinous subjects of the realm, are seen entering into National League and Covenant—confirmed and cemented by solemn oath—to maintain unsullied the honours of the Divine Redeemer, and preserve inviolate the dear-bought rights and liberties of his people—oh !—do we not behold in so blessed a change—so affecting and sublime a spectacle—a new exemplification of the words of the text—that “the hope of the righteous shall be gladness ; but the expectation of the wicked shall perish.”

And now, dear friends, that a century and a half of quietness and repose hath passed over us, what have we gained ? Alas ! Alas ! for the incorrigible waywardness and black ingratitude of the human heart—and its fearful proneness to degeneracy, even in its best estate. A period of repose is ever apt to lapse into a period of stagnation. And stagnation in the Christian Church, still worse than stagnation elsewhere, ever tends to breed—

Perverse, all monstrous, all prodigious things—
Abominable—unutterable ; and worse

Then fables yet have feigned, or fear conceiv'd,
Gorgons, and Hydras, and Chimeras dire.

Enjoying the immunities and privileges, so dearly purchased by the sufferings of our fathers—and transmitted as their legacy and heritage to latest generations:—possessed of chartered rights and blood-bought liberties:—and fenced all around by the edicts of monarchs and statutes of the supreme legislature—which some of us fondly dreamt or fancied to be substantial and imperishable as the mansion of rocks—the castles and palaces of the everlasting hills:—we got lulled asleep amid the soporific bowers of carnal security. Mean while, the great adversary of souls, never idle—ever busy—has been gradually mustering and re-inspiring his forces, for the last great struggle. And shall we, dear brethren, sit down in ignoble repose—in dull, lifeless, barren inactivity? Already, may we discern the swift crossing motions of the clouds in the upper firmament and the dark ruffling on the surface of the waters, that indicate the approaching tempest. And shall we gaze idly on, and make no effort to save our noble vessel, the ark of the everlasting covenant, from perishing amid the surging billows? Already, may we hear the growlings of the distant thunder that is soon to burst upon our tabernacles—and descry the first heavings of the earthquake that may ere long bury them amid the wreck of things that were. And shall we not be up, and in readiness, to do what in us lies to guard them, or if that be impossible, to flee for our lives and escape to the city of refuge?

Why, oh why, all this drowsiness, and dreaminess, and death-like insensibility, when all is moving, and shaking, and heaving to and fro around us? Already, hath the prophetic character of the Divine Redeemer been vindicated by the slaying of the Pagan Anti-christ. Already, hath his priestly character been vindicated by the deadly wound inflicted on the Papal Anti-christ. And now, dear friends, it will devolve on us, and the true people of God in every land, to arise and vindicate his kingly character, against the *Infidel* Anti-christ—whose forces are now gathering out of the debris and dissolution of all ancient systems and opinions, that have on them the brand and impress of one or other of the myriad-headed forms of unbelief! The kings of the earth are now setting themselves—and princes and judges are now combining against the Lord and his Anointed. No power will they tolerate—no authority will they brook, except what emanates directly or indirectly from themselves. For the ends of carnal policy and selfish aggrandizement will they seize on, and usurp, the Redeemer's intrinsic and inalienable right to rule and govern in his own House—and trample remorselessly under foot all the divinely conferred rights and liberties of his redeemed and ransomed people. With contemptuous scorn and insulting insolence, will they refuse to acknowledge Him, in his rightful supremacy, as King and Governor among the nations. Let us, then, dear friends, while testifying to all truth, bear special testimony to the truth—the great central truth—now about to be assailed by the mightiest confederacy that has been leagued in error since the world began. Let us erect our standard—and float our streaming banner to the breeze—engraved with these words, exhibiting the most radiant

jewel in the Redeemer's imperial crown—"The kingship of the Lord Jesus Christ—the Prince of all the kings of the earth—and his supreme Headship over his own kingdom of grace, both visible and invisible."

In doing so, let us deliberately count the cost. Let us be prepared for scorn and opposition and sufferings, it may be, even unto death. Let, then, no craven coward join our ranks. Better keep aloof from the first, than tarnish the honour of our cause by subsequent ignominious retreat. Some there are, I do trust and believe,—some even here, in this humble sanctuary,—who have, in the name and strength of the Most High, looked at the darkest features of these dark times, and have looked at them, unabashed, and unappalled. We court not persecution—and yet we expect no exemption from it. We know, that in the heart of every natural and unregenerate man, there lurks an undying hatred of truth—an unrelenting spirit of persecution towards its friends and advocates. What! it may be said, persecution—and that, unrelenting persecution too!—in this age of charity—and wide-spreading intelligence? Yes, even in this age of boastful charity and vaunted intelligence. The greater the charity towards error and vice, the greater the enmity towards truth and godliness. And we know that the most implacable of all foes—the most relentless of all persecutors—is just the very spirit who, to the intellect and intelligence of an archangel, unites the heart and dispositions of a fiend. And like, as he is, so will be the armies of his emissaries and allies. The mock-charity of the present age, and the conceded superiority of its intelligence over all the ages that have preceded it, may only serve, in new and unwonted and more terrible forms, to concentrate on this last, and greatest and most desperate of struggles, all the diabolical subtleties and ingenuities and energies which characterized the ante-diluvian Apostacy—the Egyptian bondage—the Babylonish captivities—and the frightful persecutions alike of the Pagan and the Papal Anti-christ. Oh, let us then be ready—let us be watchful—let us pray without ceasing. Let us clasp the Bible to our bosoms; let our grasp of its blessed truths be a death-grasp. Let the name of Jesus be precious, yea preciousness itself to our souls; let him live and reign in us; let his life be our life; his light, our light; his spirit, our spirit; his mind, our mind; his truth, our truth; his way, our way; his joy, our joy; his glory, our glory. And if, as exiles in this foreign land, we are yet forced to hang our harps upon the willows—and weep while we remember Zion, and her mournful desolations—Oh, let it even be so! Let us prefer the mockery and the scorn of cruel persecutors, that would, in our captivity, insult us by demanding a song of Zion, and thus compel us amid sobs and sighs to hang our harps, in bleak desertion, upon the willows;—let us prefer, infinitely prefer all this, to the contempt and scorn of the whole moral universe of God, by ceasing to remember Zion, and above all, Zion's dishonoured King and Zion's afflicted cause!—Yea, rather, perish—perish for ever—harps and willows and all, amid the flames that would soon reduce these bodies to ashes, at the stakes of martyrdom, than that we should prove faithless to the cause and King of Zion—than that we should cease to prefer these above our chiefest joy!

Come, then, Oh almighty Saviour!—in the infinite sympathies of thy boundless compassion. Come, Oh almighty Spirit of all grace!—in the plenitude and overflow of thy soul-reviving and comforting influences. And may the blighting of once fondly cherished hopes, and the consequent prostration of all high thoughts and lofty imaginations be, in this and all other lands, the discipline and the preparation for that night of storms, which is now so ominously brooding over the nations! And when the gloom is thickest, and the tempest of human passion loudest, and the rage of Satan, who cometh down in great wrath, fiercest,—may we have faith to discern in these, the signs and presages of that hal-
lowed morn which shall chase away the long dark night of ages—the heralds and precursors of the speedy approach of Him, whose “coming like the morn shall be, like morning songs his voice.” Then, then—amid the dawns of millennial glory, and the jubilee of a once fallen but now renovated universe,—shall we find fresh emphasis in the words of inspiration—that “the hope of the righteous shall be gladness; but the expectation of the wicked shall perish.”

Note.—At the conclusion of the whole service the preacher remarked as follows :—“The discourse or address of this morning has been purposely of a *general* character—containing only such remote allusions to some of the great principles involved in the cause that has led to our meeting here this day, as might render it not altogether inapplicable as an *introduction*—and yet, condescending on none of the *specific reasons* or *details*. From any statement of these I designedly refrained; because we have no wish that they should, without some palpable necessity, be mingled up with any of the more peculiar and appropriate exercises and solemnities of public worship. A faithful exhibition of reasons and details will ere long be afforded, in such time and place, and in such form, as may prove most convenient or best suited for edification.”

Thereafter, was read the following “Intimation :”—

“The Provisional Committee,” in connexion with the “Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland,” who have already adopted those measures, through which we have been enabled to assemble in this place to-day, beg leave to intimate, that it is their purpose, by the grace of their Lord, to render their services, for a time at least, until other and more permanent arrangements be made, for carrying on the public worship of God, as begun here this day :—

“And further, that being desirous of doing the work more effectively, by assigning the *chief* charge to *one* individual, with the promise of all need-
ful aid from the other brethren, they have requested one of their number, Mr. Macdonald, who has already had the experience of some years of pastoral work elsewhere, to undertake *usually* the office of ministering in word and doctrine to those who may thus continue to assemble with them;—and that this work he has, for the present, consented to undertake; provided he shall not be expected to give up, on account of it, any part of his regular *Missionary* work—or be required to perform more of general pastoral duty than what may be found really necessary or desirable, in any special exigencies that may occur. All this, however, is to be considered only in the light of a *temporary* and *provisional* arrangement.”

THE CALCUTTA
CHRISTIAN SCHOOL-BOOK SOCIETY.

MDCCCXLIII.

BAPTIST MISSION PRESS.

THE CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL-BOOK SOCIETY.

THE COMMITTEE OF THE CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL-BOOK SOCIETY present to their friends in India, the following list of works collected or prepared under the Society's peculiar management. They would at the same time solicit a kindly consideration of the claims, for support and co-operation, which they present, on behalf of their important cause, to all who love God and would bless man in this land—to the CHRISTIAN PEOPLE OF INDIA. These claims rest in the very elements of the Society's existence, and need only to be distinctly named, and thoughtfully considered, in order to be immediately felt and owned.

The Society's *basis* of action is to be found in our common humanity, as fellow-men. Its *principle* of constitution is drawn from our Scriptural Christianity, as given us in the word of God. Its *bond* of membership is the catholic faith of Christ our common Lord, manifested in personal co-operation. Its grand *aim* is to co-operate in blessing India, by converting her people to God, the True God. Its selected *mode*, in the general division of voluntary labour, is Christian education; education, sound in substance, varied in extent, religious in spirit, complete in result for time and for eternity. Its peculiar *function* is concentrating resources and furnishing supplies in order to facilitate, promote and increase the operations of all who are engaged, or who would engage, in the ill-provided department of Christian education in India. Lastly, the particular *instrumentality* of the Society consists in a collection of educational apparatus, made up chiefly of books adapted to the different stages of youthful instruction—of books directly Christian, where religion is directly taught—of books in spirit Christian, where only latent principle is involved—and of books free from unchristian taint and tendency (in as far as possible,) where there can be no implication of religious truth, save by remote inference or illustrative association. Such are those elements of life, eternal life, which the Society seeks to embody in its corporate existence;—and such the elements which it seeks to diffuse by public activity: and are not *such* elements, also CLAIMS? And if claims, on whom? Let the reader say.

The List now presented, of Books furnished by the Depository of the Calcutta Christian School-Book Society, may seem small when compared with the stores of other institutions. But, let it be remembered, that this is but the fourth year of the Society's existence:—that its limitation to religious principle has also occasioned a limitation of pecuniary resources:—that carefulness of selection must diminish the rapidity of supply:—and that the slowness of sale, in a field where education is as yet but little extended,

leaves publishing outlays long unpaid :—that the lowness of price, necessary in order to give free course to our works among the more needy class of native youth, brings scarcely a return sufficient to meet the mere agency of sale,—and that personal aid, especially in the most vital matter of vernacular translation, can only be obtained with difficulty, in a country where a handful are doing the work of a multitude as to the work of moral and spiritual improvement.—Let all this be remembered—and it may be that what seemed a fault, may prove an additional claim—yea a *double* claim ; for, the fewness that is *select*, may secure approbation ; and the fewness of *necessity*, may bring us the aids of kindly friendship. Free contribution will be our stimulating resource ; extensive sales our reversionary supply ;—the former, more effective to originate, and extend :—the latter, more effective to continue and execute. We plead for both aids. To one class of friends we say, “ come and help us by *giving* : ” to another class of friends we say, “ come and help us by *taking*.” Thus, by the blessing of Him whom we would acknowledge and honour in all our affairs, shall our cause prosper ! Peace be to all that love the cause of God’s glory and of man’s happiness in India !

On behalf of the Committee,

J. MACDONALD, *Corresponding Secretary.*

LIST OF THE CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL-BOOK SOCIETY’S PUBLICATIONS :

With a description of their Contents.

1. THE FIRST ENGLISH INSTRUCTOR—30 pages—price 1 anna—contains lessons from the Alphabet onwards to words of one Syllable :—Part I. Miscellaneous—Part II. Religious : with an Introduction conveying useful hints to teachers.

2. THE SAME, in ANGLO-BENGALI, interlined—pp. 43—price 3 annas.

3. THE SAME, in ANGLO-URDU—ROMAN character, interlined—price 3 annas.

4. THE SAME, in ANGLO-URDU—ARABIC character, interlined—price 3 annas.

5. The SECOND INSTRUCTOR—English—pp. 40—price 2 annas : a new and enlarged edition :—progressive lessons, chiefly in words of two syllables ;—Part I. Miscellaneous—Part II. Christian truth ;—the whole interspersed with Juvenile poetry—with a note to teachers prefixed.

6. THE SAME INSTRUCTOR is now in process of being translated into Bengali and Urdu.

7. THE BENGALI SPELLING-BOOK—or “ *Gyanamodori* ”—pp. 46—price 2 annas—a Bengali initiatory work, on a new plan, and adapted for vernacular Schools : containing lessons of a religious character, chiefly from Scripture, and at the same time, in their structure, illustrative of the peculiar combinations of the Bengali letters.

8. THE THIRD ENGLISH INSTRUCTOR—pp. 228—price 12 annas—a new edition—much enlarged—interspersed with Christian Poetry—in three parts : Part I. Miscellaneous lessons : Part II. Abridgement of Scripture History : Part III. Simple Extracts on important subjects. The Committee have been negotiating to have this INSTRUCTOR also translated into Bengali and Urdu.

9. THE FOURTH ENGLISH INSTRUCTOR—pp. 298—price 1 Rupee—a compilation of practically useful extracts in religion, science, and literature—with occasional poetry—in two parts : Part I. Miscellaneous lessons in all the above-mentioned subjects : Part II. A continuous series of Scripture

extracts from the Old and New Testaments—which may be useful in schools where the holy Scriptures are not directly admitted.

10. *THE SAME*, in *Bengali*—about one half of this Instructor has been translated into Bengali; and it is proposed that this portion, consisting of about pp. 250, be published separately. It is now in the press, and is expected to be issued in two or three months. The translation, executed by a native, under direction of a European Scholar, is considered good.

11. *THE POETIC INSTRUCTOR*—pp. 296—price 1 Rupee: a Miscellany of Poetry, calculated to please, instruct and elevate:—and in which care has been taken to exclude whatever is irreligious, in order to give to it a Christian character and tendency.

12. *MACCULLOCH'S COURSE OF ELEMENTARY READING*, in science, literature and religion; interspersed with a higher class of Poetical extracts—pp. 362—price 1 Rupee 8 annas. This work has appended to it, a copious list of the Latin and Greek Primitives which enter into the composition of the English language:—and in Britain, it is considered a useful, and has become a popular school-book.

13. *MACCULLOCH'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR*—pp. 195, price 12 annas—considered one of the best Grammars now in school use, being minutely explanatory and illustrative.

14. *THE ARITHMETICAL INSTRUCTOR*—by the Rev. Thomas Smith, General Assembly's Institution, Calcutta—pp. 200, price 12 annas. This work is prepared expressly for the use of schools in this country—having Indian tables and references; and it includes all the usual departments of practical arithmetic, to the extraction of the cube root.

15. *THE ELEMENTS OF EUCLID*—six Books—pp. 240—price 1 Rupee 8 annas, bound—adopted from "Chamber's (Edinburgh) Educational course."

16. *SOLID GEOMETRY, SPHERICS, AND CONIC SECTIONS*—pp. 164—price 1 Rupee 8 annas, bound—adopted from the same popular "Course."

17. *BRIEF SURVEY OF HISTORY*—by J. Marshman, Esq. of Serampore, in two parts or volumes:—Vol. I. From the creation of the world to the Christian era—pp. 240—price 1 Rupee 2 annas. Vol. II. From the Christian era, to the time of Charlemagne,—or the year 772—pp. 214—price 1 Rupee 2 annas. This faithful compendium of General History is well known in Indian schools:

18. *GENERAL HISTORY UPON SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES*—translated, from the German of the Rev. Dr. Barth, Wirttemberg—pp. 480, with four illustrative historical maps, price 2 Rupees. This is a peculiarly Christian work, as well as useful school-book for higher classes of students. The work includes in its sketch the whole period of time from the creation down to the present time, or the year 1840; it inculcates throughout, the most direct and Scriptural reference to the providential government of God, and especially as it regards the connexion of the world with the kingdom of Christ.

19. *HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH*, from the beginning to the present times—by the same author—pp. 220, price 12 annas. This little work, consists rather of successive sketches of the different states of the Christian Church, than of mere annals, recording the endless variety of its circumstances; and in this respect it is the more adapted for the perusal of native youth. It will be found a simple, candid, and interesting manual of a too much neglected study.

20. *THE SAME WORK*, translated into *Bengali*—may be used as an advanced school book in Christian vernacular schools.

21. *MARSHMAN'S HISTORY OF INDIA*, from remote antiquity to the accession of the Mogul dynasty—pp. 281—price 1 Rupee 3 annas—at present, an indispensable school-book in this country.

22. **MARSHMAN'S HISTORY OF BENGAL**—from the earliest time to the year 1835—pp. 293—price 1 Rupee 2 annas,—a provincial continuation of the former more general work.

23.—**GEOGRAPHY**—The Manual on this subject has been from various circumstances, delayed—but is in progress.

24. **GEOGRAPHY, in Bengali**—a small manual of the geography of the world, with enlarged details on India—particularly suited for vernacular schools:—price 4 annas.

25. **MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES**—being an abridgement of the first volume of "Horne's Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures"—edited by the Rev. Dr. Hæberlin and the Rev. W. S. Mackay, pp. 132, price 12 annas,—a compendium of almost all that can be gathered on this important subject;—and a good text-book for the more extended illustrations of the Christian Teacher.

26. **LETTERS ON THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY**—addressed to Hindus—by Philalethes—(the Rev. J. Campbell, Calcutta,) pp. 180—price 12 annas.—This book simply and kindly written, and composed expressly for native youth, may prove an excellent auxiliary to the preceding work; being addressed to the heart and conscience, as well as to the understanding, of the reader.

27. **HINDUISM AND CHRISTIANITY CONTRASTED**—by the Rev. G. Mundy, Chinsurah, 2 volumes—pp. 280, 411—price 1 Rupee, 8 annas. This work is now the copy-right of the Society, and the remaining copies of the present edition are disposed of at the above price. It will be found useful in the hand of the young Missionary, or inexperienced Christian teacher;—and we have no other work to take its particular place, in the upper classes of Christian Institutions, for Hindus.

• 28. **THE SHORTER CATECHISM**, by the Westminster Assembly of Divines with Scripture proofs. This microcosm of Christian doctrine needs no other commendation or notice than the mention of its well-known name:—and some, who entertain a difference of opinion in regard to one or two points involved in it, have heartily joined in its adoption, because of its general excellence, and established usefulness.

29. **HISTORY OF THE JEWS**—Book 1st.—pp. 58—price 2 annas,—being the commencement of a complete and faithful abridgement of Old Testament History, by a Gentleman in the Indian Service, and intended for Educational Institutions. This first part is complete in itself, comprising the whole substance of the Pentateuch—from the creation till the death of Moses.

30. **NOTES OF THE BOOK OF NATURE**—by the same author—pp. 177—price 6 annas. This work includes in it a course of consecutive readings, in Natural History and Natural Theology, combined:—in the several departments of bodies, inorganic and organic—the kingdoms of nature, inanimate and animate;—and is so compiled as to form a continuous composition.

31. **POLITICAL ECONOMY**. The "Calcutta School-Book Society," have in the kindest manner granted to the "Calcutta Christian School-Book Society," the free use of "Clift's Political Economy," to be published by the latter body, in such form as may best harmonize with their particular object, in promoting a directly Christian education. This work has been committed to a competent friend;—and although the preparation of such a work may require some considerable time, yet it is hoped, that in the end it will form a useful acquisition to the cause of education.

32. **MAPS OF THE WORLD**—in sets of six—Eastern Hemisphere, Western Hemisphere, Europe, Asia, Africa, America—in sheets, Rupees 30 a set—varnished and mounted at a separate charge, as may be ordered.

33. *GLOBES, Terrestrial and Celestial*—of 9, 12 and 18 inches, have been ordered from Britain—and advices have been received of their now being on the way.

LAWS OF THE SOCIETY.

I. The name of the Society shall be, the "**CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL-BOOK SOCIETY.**"

II. The bond of the Society shall be, those grand Christian doctrines in which the Protestant Evangelical churches are agreed.

III. The special object of the Society shall be, to obtain and furnish a supply of books in the English and Native languages, for promoting education on Christian principles.

IV. Such general school-books only shall be kept by the Society, as are not inconsistent with the word of God:—and such religious school-books only, as are decidedly scriptural.

V. The necessary supply of books shall be obtained by original composition, republication, or by purchase, as may seem best.

VI. The Society's works shall be sold at the lowest price consistent with pecuniary obligations, and the necessary expense of agency: and the Society shall retain a power, in special cases, to dispose of books at reduced rates.

VII. The Society shall also be at liberty, if expedient, to use its influence, in any more general form, for the advancement of the grand object of Christian education.

VIII. There shall be a "General Committee" for managing the business of the Society, with a special "Sub-Committee" to superintend the preparation and publishing of books.

IX. Subscribers, to whatever amount, shall be considered members of the Society.

X. The formation of Local Committees throughout the country shall be solicited and promoted, in order to co-operate with the General Committee in Calcutta.

THE GENERAL COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT consists of the following gentlemen:—

Alexander, J. W., Esq.

Boaz, Rev. T.

Doswell, Rev. R. B.

Byrne, Wale, Esq.

Campbell, Rev. J.

Charles, Rev. Jas., D. D.

De Rodt, Rev. R.

Duff, Rev. A., D. D.

Hæberlin, Rev. J., D. D.

Hawkins, J., Esq.

Ewart, Rev. D.

Mackay, Rev. W. S.

Meiklejohn, Rev. W. H.

Roxburgh, Capt. J.

Sandys, Rev. T.

Small, Rev. G.

Smith, Rev. T.

SUB-COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.—Messrs. Alexander, Campbell, Ewart, Long, Macdonald, Mackay, Small, and Drs. Duff and Hæberlin.

SECRETARIES.

Minute Secretary—Rev. J. Campbell. *Corresponding Secretary*—Rev. J. Macdonald. *Cash Secretary*—J. W. Alexander, Esq.

* * Contributions to be forwarded to the Secretaries, and orders for books to the Depository Agent, Mr. G. C. Hay, (Messrs. Hay, Meik and Co.) No. 7, Old Court House Corner, Calcutta.

THE CALCUTTA
CHRISTIAN SCHOOL-BOOK SOCIETY.

MDCCCXLIII.

BAPTIST MISSION PRESS.

,

THE CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL-BOOK SOCIETY.

THE COMMITTEE OF THE CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL-BOOK SOCIETY present to their friends in India, the following list of works collected or prepared under the Society's peculiar management. They would at the same time solicit a kindly consideration of the claims, for support and co-operation, which they present, on behalf of their important cause, to all who love God and would bless man in this land—to the CHRISTIAN PEOPLE OF INDIA. These claims rest in the very elements of the Society's existence, and need only to be distinctly named, and thoughtfully considered, in order to be immediately felt and owned.

The Society's *basis* of action is to be found in our common humanity, as fellow-men. Its *principle* of constitution is drawn from our Scriptural Christianity, as given us in the word of God. Its *bond* of membership is the catholic faith of Christ our common Lord, manifested in personal co-operation. Its *grand aim* is to co-operate in blessing India, by converting her people to God, the True God. Its *selected mode*, in the general division of voluntary labour, is Christian education; education, sound in substance, varied in extent, religious in spirit, complete in result for time and for eternity. Its *peculiar function* is concentrating resources and furnishing supplies in order to facilitate, promote and increase the operations of all who are engaged, or who would engage, in the ill-provided department of Christian education in India. Lastly, the particular *instrumentality* of the Society consists in a collection of educational apparatus, made up chiefly of books adapted to the different stages of youthful instruction—of books directly Christian, where religion is directly taught—of books in spirit Christian, where only latent principle is involved—and of books free from unchristian taint and tendency (in as far as possible,) where there can be no implication of religious truth, save by remote inference or illustrative association. Such are those elements of life, eternal life, which the Society seeks to embody in its corporate existence;—and such the elements which it seeks to diffuse by public activity: and are not *such* elements, also *CLAIMS*? And if claims, on whom? Let the reader say.

The List now presented, of Books furnished by the Depository of the Calcutta Christian School-Book Society, may seem small when compared with the stores of other institutions. But, let it be remembered, that this is but the fourth year of the Society's existence:—that its limitation to religious principle has also occasioned a limitation of pecuniary resources:—that carefulness of selection must diminish the rapidity of supply:—and that the slowness of sale, in a field where education is as yet but little extended,

leaves publishing outlays long unrepaid :—that the lowness of price, necessary in order to give free course to our works among the more needy class of native youth, brings scarcely a return sufficient to meet the mere agency of sale,—and that personal aid, especially in the most vital matter of vernacular translation, can only be obtained with difficulty, in a country where a handful are doing the work of a multitude as to the work of moral and spiritual improvement.—Let all this be remembered—and it may be that what seemed a fault, may prove an additional claim—yea a *double* claim ; for, the fewness that is *select*, may secure approbation ; and the fewness of *necessity*, may bring us the aids of kindly friendship. Free contribution will be our stimulating resource ; extensive sales our reversionary supply ;—the former, more effective to originate, and extend :—the latter, more effective to continue and execute. We plead for both aids. To one class of friends we say, “ come and help us by *giving* :” to another class of friends we say, “ come and help us by *taking*.” Thus, by the blessing of Him whom we would acknowledge and honour in all our affairs, shall our cause prosper ! Peace be to all that love the cause of God’s glory and of man’s happiness in India !

On behalf of the Committee,

J. MACDONALD, *Corresponding Secretary*.

LIST OF THE CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL-BOOK SOCIETY’S PUBLICATIONS :

With a description of their Contents.

1. THE FIRST ENGLISH INSTRUCTOR—30 pages—price 1 anna—contains lessons from the Alphabet onwards to words of one Syllable :—Part I. Miscellaneous—Part II. Religious : with an Introduction conveying useful hints to teachers.

2. THE SAME, in ANGLO-BENGALI, interlined—pp. 43—price 3 annas.

3. THE SAME, in ANGLO-URDU—ROMAN character, interlined—price 3 annas.

4. THE SAME, in ANGLO-URDU—ARABIC character, interlined—price 3 annas.

5. THE SECOND INSTRUCTOR—English—pp. 40—price 2 annas : a new and enlarged edition ;—progressive lessons, chiefly in words of two syllables ;—Part I. Miscellaneous—Part II. Christian truth ;—the whole interspersed with Juvenile poetry—with a note to teachers prefixed.

6. THE SAME INSTRUCTOR is now in process of being translated into Bengali and Urdu.

7. THE BENGALI SPELLING-BOOK—or “ *Gyanarunodoi*”—pp. 46—price 2 annas—a Bengali initiatory work, on a new plan, and adapted for vernacular Schools : containing lessons of a religious character, chiefly from Scripture, and at the same time, in their structure, illustrative of the peculiar combinations of the Bengali letters.

8. THE THIRD ENGLISH INSTRUCTOR—pp. 228—price 12 annas—a new edition much enlarged—interspersed with Christian Poetry—in three parts : Part I. Miscellaneous lessons : Part II. Abridgement of Scripture History : Part III. Simple Extracts on important subjects. The Committee have been negotiating to have this INSTRUCTOR also translated into Bengali and Urdu.

9. THE FOURTH ENGLISH INSTRUCTOR—pp. 228—price 1 Rupee—a compilation of practically useful extracts in religion, science, and literature—with occasional poetry—in two parts : Part I. Miscellaneous lessons in all the above-mentioned subjects : Part II. A continuous series of Scripture

extracts from the Old and New Testaments—which may be useful in schools where the holy Scriptures are not directly admitted.

10. *THE SAME, in Bengali*—about one half of this Instructor has been translated into Bengali; and it is proposed that this portion, consisting of about pp. 250, be published separately. It is now in the press, and is expected to be issued in two or three months. The translation, executed by a native, under direction of a European Scholar, is considered good.

11. *THE POETIC INSTRUCTOR*—pp. 296—price 1 Rupee: a Miscellany of Poetry, calculated to please, instruct and elevate:—and in which care has been taken to exclude whatever is irreligious, in order to give to it a Christian character and tendency.

12. *MACCULLOCH'S COURSE OF ELEMENTARY READING*, in science, literature and religion; interspersed with a higher class of Poetical extracts—pp. 362—price 1 Rupee 8 annas. This work has appended to it, a copious list of the Latin and Greek Primitives which enter into the composition of the English language:—and in Britain, it is considered a useful, and has become a popular school-book.

13. *MACCULLOCH'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR*—pp. 195, price 12 annas—considered one of the best Grammars now in school use, being minutely explanatory and illustrative.

14. *THE ARITHMETICAL INSTRUCTOR*—by the Rev. Thomas Smith, General Assembly's Institution, Calcutta—pp. 200, price 12 annas. This work is prepared expressly for the use of schools in this country—having Indian tables and references; and it includes all the usual departments of practical arithmetic, to the extraction of the cube root.

15. *THE ELEMENTS OF EUCLID*—six Books—pp. 240—price 1 Rupee 8 annas, bound—adopted from "Chamber's (Edinburgh) Educational course."

16. *SOLID GEOMETRY, SPHERICS, AND CONIC SECTIONS*—pp. 164—price 1 Rupee 8 annas, bound—adopted from the same popular "Course."

17. *BRIEF SURVEY OF HISTORY*—by J. Marshman, Esq. of Serampore, in two parts or volumes:—Vol. I. From the creation of the world to the Christian era—pp. 240—price 1 Rupee 2 annas. Vol. II. From the Christian era, to the time of Charlemagne,—or the year 772—pp. 214—price 1 Rupee 2 annas. This faithful compendium of General History is well known in Indian schools.

18. *GENERAL HISTORY UPON SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES*—translated, from the German of the Rev. Dr. Barth, Wirttemberg—pp. 480, with four illustrative historical maps, price 2 Rupees. This is a peculiarly Christian work, as well as useful school-book for higher classes of students. The work includes in its sketch the whole period of time from the creation down to the present time, or the year 1840; it inculcates throughout, the most direct and Scriptural reference to the providential government of God, and especially as it regards the connexion of the world with the kingdom of Christ.

19. *HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH*, from the beginning to the present times—by the same author—pp. 220, price 12 annas. This little work, consists rather of successive sketches of the different states of the Christian Church, than of mere annals, recording the endless variety of its circumstances; and in this respect it is the more adapted for the perusal of native youth. It will be found, a simple, candid, and interesting manual of a too much neglected study.

20. *THE SAME WORK, translated into Bengali*—may be used as an advanced school book in Christian vernacular schools.

21. *MARSHMAN'S HISTORY OF INDIA*, from remote antiquity to the accession of the Mogul dynasty—pp. 231—price 1 Rupee 2 annas—at present, an indispensable school-book in this country.

22. **MARSHMAN'S HISTORY OF BENGAL**—from the earliest time to the year 1833—pp. 293—price 1 Rupee 2 annas,—a provincial continuation of the former more general work.

23. —**GEOGRAPHY**—The Manual on this subject has been from various circumstances, delayed—but is in progress.

24. **GEOGRAPHY, in Bengali**—a small manual of the geography of the world, with enlarged details on India—particularly suited for vernacular schools :—price 4 annas.

25. **MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES**—being an abridgement of the first volume of "Horne's Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures"—edited by the Rev. Dr. Hæberlin and the Rev. W. S. Mackay, pp. 132, price 12 annas,—a compendium of almost all that can be gathered on this important subject ;—and a good text-book for the more extended illustrations of the Christian Teacher.

26. **LETTERS ON THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY**—addressed to Hindus—by Philalethes—(the Rev. J. Campbell, Calcutta,) pp. 180—price 12 annas.—This book simply and kindly written, and composed expressly for native youth, may prove an excellent auxiliary to the preceding work ; being addressed to the heart and conscience, as well as to the understanding, of the reader.

27. **HINDUISM AND CHRISTIANITY CONTRASTED**—by the Rev. G. Mundy, Chinsurah, 2 volumes—pp. 280, 411—price 1 Rupee, 8 annas. This work is now the copy-right of the Society, and the remaining copies of the present edition are disposed of at the above price. It will be found useful in the hand of the young Missionary, or inexperienced Christian teacher ;—and we have no other work to take its particular place, in the upper classes of Christian Institutions, for Hindus.

28. **THE SHORTER CATECHISM**, by the Westminster Assembly of Divines with Scripture proofs. This microcosm of Christian doctrine needs no other commendation or notice than the mention of its well-known name :—and some, who entertain a difference of opinion in regard to one or two points involved in it, have heartily joined in its adoption, because of its general excellence, and established usefulness.

29. **HISTORY OF THE JEWS**—Book 1st.—pp. 58—price 2 annas,—being the commencement of a complete and faithful abridgement of Old Testament History, by a Gentleman in the Indian Service, and intended for Educational Institutions. This first part is complete in itself, comprising the whole substance of the Pentateuch—from the creation till the death of Moses.

30. **NOTES OF THE BOOK OF NATURE**—by the same author—pp. 177—price 6 annas. This work includes in it a course of consecutive readings, in Natural History and Natural Theology, combined :—in the several departments of bodies, inorganic and organic—the kingdoms of nature, inanimate and animate ;—and is so compiled as to form a continuous composition.

31. **POLITICAL ECONOMY**. The "Calcutta School-Book Society," have in the kindest manner granted to the "Calcutta Christian School-Book Society," the free use of "Clift's Political Economy," to be published by the latter body, in such form as may best harmonize with their particular object, in promoting a directly Christian education. This work has been committed to a competent friend ;—and although the preparation of such a work may require some considerable time, yet it is hoped, that in the end it will form a useful acquisition to the cause of education.

32. **MAPS OF THE WORLD**—in sets of six—Eastern Hemisphere, Western Hemisphere, Europe, Asia, Africa, America—in sheets, Rupers 30 a set—varnished and mounted at a separate charge, as may be ordered.

33. *GLOBES, Terrestrial and Celestial*—of 9, 12 and 18 inches, have been ordered from Britain—and advices have been received of their now being on the way.

LAWS OF THE SOCIETY.

I. The name of the Society shall be, the "**CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL-BOOK SOCIETY.**"

II. The bond of the Society shall be, those grand Christian doctrines in which the Protestant Evangelical churches are agreed.

III. The special object of the Society shall be, to obtain and furnish a supply of books in the English and native languages, for promoting education on Christian principles.

IV. Such general school-books only shall be kept by the Society, as are not inconsistent with the word of God:—and such religious school-books only, are as decidedly scriptural.

V. The necessary supply of books shall be obtained by original composition, republication, or by purchase, as may seem best.

VI. The Society's works shall be sold at the lowest price consistent with pecuniary obligations, and the necessary expense of agency: and the Society shall retain a power, in special cases, to dispose of books at reduced rates.

VII. The Society shall also be at liberty, if expedient, to use its influence, in any more general form, for the advancement of the grand object of Christian education.

VIII. There shall be a "General Committee" for managing the business of the Society, with a special "Sub-Committee" to superintend the preparation and publishing of books.

IX. Subscribers, to whatever amount, shall be considered members of the Society.

X. The formation of Local Committees throughout the country shall be solicited and promoted, in order to co-operate with the General Committee in Calcutta.

THE GENERAL COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT consists of the following gentlemen:—

Alexander, J. W., Esq.

Boaz, Rev. T.

Boswell, Rev. R. B.

Byrne, Wale, Esq.

Campbell, Rev. J.

Charles, Rev. Jas, D. D.

De Rodt, Rev. R.

Duff, Rev. A., D. D.

Hæberlin, Rev. J., D. D.

Hawkins, J., Esq.

Ewart, Rev. D.

Mackay, Rev. W. S.

Meiklejohn, Rev. W. H.

Roxburgh, Capt. J.

Sandys, Rev. T.

Small, Rev. G.

Smith, Rev. T.

SUB-COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.—Messrs. Alexander, Campbell, Ewart, Long, Macdonald, Mackay, Small, and Drs. Duff and Hæberlin.

SECRETARIES.

Minute Secretary—Rev. J. Campbell. *Corresponding Secretary*—Rev. J. Macdonald. *Cash Secretary*—J. W. Alexander, Esq.

*. Contributions to be forwarded to the Secretaries, and orders for books to the Depository Agent, Mr. G. C. Hay, (Messrs. Hay, Meik and Co.) No. 7, Old Court House Corner, Calcutta.

A P P E A L
OF THE
FRIENDS
OF
RELIGION AND HUMANITY
TO THEIR
FELLOW CHRISTIANS
ON
THE PROPRIETY OF DISSOLVING THE CONNEXION OF
THE BRITISH INDIAN GOVERNMENT
WITH
THE IDOLATRY OF INDIA.
WITH
AN APPENDIX.

CALCUTTA :

PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, CIRCULAR ROAD.

1838.

A P P E A L,

&c. &c.

DEAR FRIENDS,

We would crave your serious attention and prayerful reflection in a matter of *the deepest* moment to the interests of religion in the East and to the welfare of millions of our Hindu fellow-subjects—we refer to *the connexion of the British Government with the Idolatry of India*. In calling your attention to the subject we have, for the better understanding of its different relations and influences, divided our address into three distinct heads, under the respective titles of the *monetary or pecuniary*, the *illustrative and confirmatory*, and the *moral and religious*. Under the first, we propose to exhibit all the pecuniary bearings of the subject, including the gross income and expenditure upon and the net revenue derived from the connexion with idolatry. Under the second division, we purpose to give facts illustrative and confirmatory of the different kinds of connexion which at present subsist between the ruling powers and these abominations. And under the third and last, we design to treat of the moral and religious, or rather the immoral and irreligious, bearings of the whole subject. The appendix will contain facts, &c. illustrative or explanatory of our previous statements or accounts of the progress of the subject since the penning of the pamphlet. The facts and pecuniary statements are derived from sources of unquestionable and undisputed authority—they are the result of long and well conducted investigation; they have been culled from documents not for their flagrancy, but for their truth and undisputed authority. We might have increased both the number and hideousness of our facts, but not from sources that could have influenced the Government to adopt any effectual measure for the redress of the grievance of which we complain. The papers from which this pamphlet has been compiled, appeared originally in the *Calcutta Christian Observer* for the months of April, May and June, 1838, they have been adopted with some slight modifications. We

disclaim at the very threshold of our remarks all personalities, all intention to misrepresent, or to speak disrespectfully of the ruling powers. Such is not our wish or our design;—but if duty to the Most High and to the cause of Religion, should oblige us to speak in severe yet, just language, we pray the indulgence of the reader to the close, and seek for our defence under the protection of *Him* who declares it impossible to serve God and Mammon, supported by the conduct of his honored servant who declares that there can be no connexion between Christ and Belial, and exhorts all who love our Lord Jesus to come out and be separate from such alliances; because they are “the temples of the Holy Ghost,” and the representatives of the humanity and holiness of Heaven. We call your attention therefore first to

The Pecuniary or Monetary

part of this subject.

The connexion of the British Government with the idolatry of India has now become a subject of deep interest and solicitude to the philanthropists of Britain, and we wish it to be so to those of India. The feelings of the religious and humane at home have been excited towards the subject, and their first energies put forth to effect a separation of the unholy alliance between the powers of darkness and the representatives of a Christian people in a heathen country; an alliance as disgraceful to the country we represent, as it is opposed to the reforming principles and practice of professedly liberal statesmen, and a blot—a most foul blot—on a system of Government matured by the statesmen of a Christian nation. We feel assured that those feelings have but to be legitimately wrought upon and that energy rightly directed, to effect “the consummation so devoutly to be wished.” Feeling that we, who are on the spot, have a part to play in this important drama, as well as those at home, our inquiry has been in what way can our efforts and energies apply with the greatest advantage to the good cause? remembering that, as violence is to be deprecated in the advocacy of *all* truth, so agitation of a more public character would be impolitic in this, until the public mind shall be enlightened upon the subject and shall feel and act with the energy of one man. We were the more inclined to this peaceful but, we hope, effectual way of accomplishing our design, from the fact that a large proportion of those who might be expected to understand the subject are but imperfectly informed either as to the nature or influence of the connexion reprobated and condemned. We have

therefore determined to publish the most accurate information relative to this subject, accompanied by remarks dictated not by the love of party, but by a sincere desire to advance the cause of equity and truth. In order that the information obtained may not lose its force by going forth under an anonymous signature, a provisional committee was organized*, whose object it has been to inquire into the accuracy of such statements as were presented for publication. It is hoped that while this has, on the one hand, been a check upon exaggerated reports, it will on the other give a character and influence to the statements which they could not possibly derive from individual influence however potent. We have no party purposes to serve in this matter; the advocacy and advancement of true religion, the upholding of public morals, and the protection and extension of civil and religious liberty—these are the only causes that “move us to the deed.” We firmly believe all these to be prostrated, impeded, or retarded, by the connexion which at this moment subsists between a Government exclusively composed of professedly Christian men representing a Christian people in a heathen land, and the idolatry of the country. In carrying out our intention, we have no wish to touch men but measures; nor to attack Jagannáth or the Imámbará separately, but the *great principle of the union*; hoping, if we should succeed in showing that to be at variance with civil freedom, moral rectitude, and religious truth, we shall have made out a case that must induce “the powers that be,” to say of the idolatry of India, “Thy money,” if we must administer it for such purposes “perish with thee!” Should we employ in our appeal, one word or expression that may appear to bear with undue severity on those whom we respect in high places, we once for all disavow any thing personal or the remotest intention to wound; we entreat them to believe that our love of truth would rather induce us “in calmest reason” to beseech them to retire from the questionable position which as the followers of Christ they now hold. Rather would we do this, than rashly wound and exasperate; and we hope our regard for truth would not only induce us to expostulate with *them*, but to sacrifice on its altar the most endeared connexion we may or can have, were it necessary, to vindicate the insulted Majesty of Heaven. We most willingly concede to such sincerity of intention, while we think it is not only our duty, but our imperative duty, to repro-

* It is under the direction of this Committee that the pamphlet is now printed; similar Committees have been organized at Madras and Bombay.

bate the position in which they are content to remain, withal most sincerely protesting against the dark measures to which they often affix not only their official seals but also their signatures. How sinful must it appear in the eyes of the Omniscient, when a poor deluded pilgrim casts himself for salvation at the feet of Jagannáth, that the regulation which sanctions the deed and the ticket which obtains him admittance within the pale of "the refuge of lies," are signed if not actually approved, by otherwise sincere followers of Jesus! Oh! are there no Daniels, no Ezras, no noble spirited men amongst the high and powerful, who dare rise superior to the vulgar and enlaved prejudices of the world? men who by* washing their hands of these evils may set a nobly contagious example? We are not unmindful that many of those now referred to are diligently endeavouring to promote the object so near our heart, and we hope, though we cannot approve their timid policy, that, as the mysteries of divine Providence are explained by the great and all-wise Interpreter Himself, it will be seen that our great purpose will be ultimately subserved even by their fluttering residence within, as well as by our more daring fights without, the idolatrous pale. Our warmth and their prudential proceedings may both be essential to place things in such a state as, the more effectually, at some future period, to sever the connexion at once and for ever. We think the time has come, however, when it would be impious in us either to be silent or calm on such a topic; patience alone has done nothing to remedy the evil; nor, were it exercised for some coming ages, unaided by a fearless yet faithful exposure of things as they are, would it meet with other reward than disappointment and chagrin. As we impute no evil motives even to those who oppose us, much less to such as cannot accompany us the full extent of *our* feeling and action on this subject, we crave the mere indulgence of being permitted to pursue our work, without the imputation of improper motives, and we hope we shall be able to avoid every thing which might exasperate or increase the opposition of the abettors of the system.

Many of our *friends* appear to be comparatively in the clouds both as to the nature and influence of the Government connexion with Idolatry. It may not therefore be impolitic to state that the connexion involves matters *pecuniary, civil, moral* and *religious*. The union does not subsist merely between the Government and Hindú temples and holy places, but extends also to Musalmán mosques and places of religious resort of both sects. The *Revenue* is derived from en-

* See Appendix, No. I.

dowments of land and money, from the incomes of temples, religious places and mosques, from taxes paid by devotees and pilgrims, from the accumulated and accumulating lakhs of the *Imámbarás*; and from the miserable rupee of the hunted and infatuated pilgrim. The immediate *sanction* which is given by the Government, consists in receiving the income of all these; in repairing, arranging, and supporting, even to the very minutest details, the worship of the temples and mosques; and would that it could be blotted out of the page of history! that a Christian Government sends forth men, "as pilgrim-hunters," to find victims whose superstition shall be made the means of replenishing the coffers of the Company! Nor does it rest even here: for not only does the paternal government of India afford its protection to hold its debased Hindu and Musalmán subjects in ignorance, but forces those who are the professors of a purer faith, in opposition to the dictates of an enlightened conscience and a sense of common decency, to be *officially* present at heathen and Musalmán festivals, and to fire salutes on the days held sacred by either party, thus giving honor equally to Christ their divine Master, to the false prophet, and to Vishnu, &c.*! This we believe is the nature of the connexion we seek to dissolve. Of its injurious tendency, we need scarcely say a word; it is "of the earth earthy;" it can but continue to debase and enslave the millions of miserable Hindus and Musalmáns, and to inflict the severest pain on the upright Christian servants of the Government.

We are free to confess that there is much difficulty in that part of the subject which effects endowments made by the subjects of former Governments, and which were made over to the British at the time of their conquest of India, to be appropriated, *in perpetuum*, to the special purposes of the donor†. The intentions of the dead should, if possible, be held sacred; but still, if the dead should even have bequeathed property for the upholding or extending of that which after ages shall discover to be error whether in a philosophical, rational, or religious sense, surely a wise and paternal government is warranted, in applying that property to purposes which would have comported with the donor's intentions, had he lived in an enlightened instead of an iron age. Nor are we without examples of this kind in the feelings and operations of governments: nay we should not be at a loss for support to such a mode of procedure in some very recent movements even of the Indian Government. There are legitimate

* See Appendix, No. II.

† See Appendix, No. III.

means at hand to surmount these and all other difficulties. But, as it regards the dissolution of partnership between the other, idolatrous, departments and the Government, there can be none—no, not the shadow of a difficulty.

As our wishes in this matter have been misunderstood and misrepresented, it may be as well to state what it is we desire. We do not wish the government to move in a crusade against temples and mosques, nor to throw their revenues into the sacred stream, and divide their lands among its servants. This is not what we wish. All that we ask is, that the government should be in practice, what they boast they are in theory—*neutral in matters of religion*. This is all we ask. Are we unreasonable men? We but solicit the government to carry out towards *all* the principles of toleration which they profess to exercise towards the majority. We do not ask it as a boon, but as a right; not as mere agitators, but as the most sincere well-wishers to the permanent welfare of the British rule in India; and if we do not (at least as far as fair and dispassionate reasoning, based upon and deducible from undoubted facts, can convince), show, that the dissolution of this union would be the means of binding, in a more indissoluble bond, our political relations with the people of India, and of giving us that which is of more moment than all, a *religious* influence over the millions of the land, we will then allow the alliance to continue unmolested and “believe it lawful.” At present we feel assured that if this at least be neglected by the British rulers of India, the churches of Christ, planted by feeble Missionaries, will lift up their heads in the land when the political glory of Britain shall have past away for ever!

In calling attention to this subject in this distinct, and we hope, practical manner, it would be ungenerous not to mention the exertions of the Rev. Mr. Peggs, formerly of the Orissa Mission, and of J. Poynder, Esq. one of the proprietors of East India Stock. To the efforts of this latter gentleman it is that we are chiefly indebted for nearly all the movements and correct returns connected with the subject, and for the hope, however faint it may be, of the final cessation of every vestige of the unholy alliance.

In the year 1832, Mr. Poynder made a motion on this subject; resolutions were founded on that motion, expressing the wish of the Court of proprietors that the *connexion should cease “as soon as practicable.”* Since that time, it is but just to say, that the whole Indian state apparatus has been put in requisition to obtain accurate

information ; that information is, we believe, now in the possession of Government, the decision of the Court on that evidence is promulgated ; *they will not at present concede our prayer*. We exhort the public to be up and doing. Since the motion referred to, in 1832, Mr. Poynder has made several others without effect, the last but one being most decidedly unpropitious in the view of those unused to the secret movements of governments* ; not the most limited pledge, no not even the shadow of a resolution, would pass at that meeting—not even one pledging the Indian Government to carry out, as soon as practicable, *its own former resolves and directions* ! Why was this ? The British public, in their innocence, believed, from the first, that the terms “as soon as practicable” meant almost immediately : they little thought that it meant, “we will obtain information on the subject, and, if we find the connexion productive of but limited profits, we will abolish it, but should it be found to fill our coffers, it shall be continued.” Little did the unsuspecting people of England think *that* ; and yet we pledge ourselves to shew that *this was* the spirit of the resolution. We gather this from the increasing opposition with which the efforts of Mr. Poynder have been met at home, as the amount of golden advantage from the connexion has been evident ; and, above all, from the cold, deliberate and negative answer of the Court to the prayer of the ever-beloved Corrie and his friends. In 1832, the Court of Directors, comparatively ignorant as to the amount of revenue derived from this source, to satisfy and quiet the feeling excited in Britain on the subject, passed resolutions indicating a desire to abolish the connexion. In 1837, if we are rightly informed, they forbade most positively, the cessation of any, even the most limited sanction, which they had ever given to idolatry. What has wrought the change ? It is but fair however to state, that a large sum out of the general fund is expended on the repairs of the principal roads and in providing hotels for the pilgrims, and for other good objects accidentally connected with the operations of the system. Measures are also, we believe, now adopting for handing over the whole conduct of Jagannáth and the Cuttack share of the evils, as an experiment, to Native instead of European superintendence. If it is, however, still to be under the sanction of Government, the evil will but be increased. The oppression, robbery and cruelty which will be practised by natives, invested with a little brief

* See Appendix, No. III.

authority, will be but adding a millstone to the pebble, but multiplying the evil a thousand-fold. Our advice to the Government is, "*let it alone*, and, in 20 years, these festivals will cease to be connected with religious fanaticism, which is that most nervously apprehended by you." They will become either the mere resorts of trade as fairs, or scenes of gay festivity, like our Christmas and other semi-pagan feasts and wakes. *All* such legislation will be ineffective here and unsatisfactory at home^{*}; and the plan referred to in particular, would be productive of oppression and fraught with the elements of insurrection. As the Court of Directors and the Supreme Government have carefully eschewed all discussion and research on the subject, all reference to the religious and moral bearings of the question, and have simply confined themselves to it as a matter of *profit and loss*, we shall, in the first instance, refer our readers to the Government connexion with Idolatry, as it involves *pecuniary considerations*.

Our readers will probably have already seen the despatch from the Court of Directors, dated 20th February, 1833, respecting the existing connexion of the British Government with the shrines of native idolatry, which was published in the *Friend of India*†. We have, since the publication of that article, been diligent in collecting the most authentic information, information on which we think some reliance may be placed. If it be incorrect we shall be most happy to retract our errors; our object being not to misrepresent but inform,—not the triumph of a party, but of truth.

On the receipt of the Court's despatch, instructions were issued by the Supreme Government, of which we are not in possession; but something of the purport may be gathered from the following circular, which was directed by the Government of Bombay, in July, 1835, to the subordinate officers at that Presidency.

" CIRCULAR.

" To _____

" Sir,

" As it is highly desirable that some uniform principle should be adopted with respect to the relinquishment, or otherwise, of revenue at present derived from Idol worship, I am directed by the Right Hon'ble the Governor in Council to request that you will, with the aid of the assistant collectors under your control, submit the following statements and information to enable Government to come to a decision on the subject.

* See Appendix, No. IV.

† See Appendix, No. V.

"First.—An account of all the idols, temples, or religious establishments within your collectorate, which are supported wholly or in part by Government aid or funds ; distinguishing where the aid consists in lands held under Government grants ; where in money advances generally, from the Treasury ; where in money raised for the particular purpose by taxes levied on worshippers or others ; and where in any gift or assistance of any other kind : and stating the origin of such aids being granted, and its amount, if ascertainable.

"Secondly.—An account of all cases in which Government, either directly or indirectly, derive revenue from the persons who have the guardianship of such idols, temples, or religious establishments, or who attend them as worshippers ; distinguishing where such revenue is raised by taxation on the worshippers or attendants ; where it consists in a participation in the gifts or offerings made by such worshippers ; or where it subsists in any other form ; and stating the amount of revenue thus derived, and (where there is a participation between Government and the idol, temple, or religious establishment), the proportion between the shares.

"2nd. The Governor in Council does not wish for minute details of the superstitious usages prevalent in these cases, or of their history : what is wanted is an authentic report of the actual state of things, in illustration of two points ; *first*, what aid, in money or money's worth, Government are giving to the superstitions of the country ; and *secondly*, what aid, in money or money's worth, Government are receiving from those superstitions.

"3rd. Possessed of the general object of Government, you will be enabled to supply the information bearing on it, even though not required by the letter of these instructions : The Governor in Council doubts not that you will see the necessity of making your report as speedily as the simultaneous pursuit of your more immediate avocations will permit.

"4th. Such statements as it may be necessary to hand up, should be framed on foolscap paper ; and you will be careful, when using native terms, to fix the definitions in English ; and when quoting Indian dates, to cite the corresponding English ones.

"I have, &c. "

"Bombay Castle, 1835.

————— *Secy. to Govt."*

Simultaneously with the above, instructions were also issued by the subordinate Governments of Madras and Bengal. We believe the general results of the returns furnished in answer to this circular,

comprising a period of ten years commencing with 1823-24 and ending in 1832-33, are as follows.

	Annual Income.	Annual Expense.	Annual Surplus.	Annual Deficit.
Bengal, including the } N. W. Provinces,..... }	461,967	233,670	228,297	...
Madras,.....	4,056,286	3,882,373	173,713	...
Bombay,.....	40,339	66,850	...	26,511
Total,....	4,558,592	4,183,093	402,010	26,511
		Deduct deficit,	26,511	

Nett surplus per annum, 375,499

If we are rightly informed,* these statements were considered defective, as not shewing distinctly the extent to which the public resources, whether in money or lands, had been alienated by former Governments, and which, it is thought, must necessarily be upheld by the British authorities; nor was the amount of revenue which would necessarily be lost or of disbursements which would be saved upon the withdrawal of the patronage of Government to native shrines, &c. clearly exhibited.

Revised statements have, we understand, been since received; the extent of the alienations in the Madras Presidency, or of the certain nett loss which the Government would sustain by the cessation of its interference, is not accurately known*; but under the Bombay Presidency, the nett loss to Government is about 9000 rupees.

The extent to which the public resources in money and lands are alienated at Bombay, and which cannot be recalled by the Government, may be stated, with some approximation to accuracy, at rupees 580,000.

Of alienations in land (there are none, we believe in money) in the Western Provinces, the British Government have either themselves assigned, or have confirmed the grants from former Governments or from individuals, to the following probable amount of Revenue.

To Hindus.

Rupees 300,000.

To Muhammadans.

Rupees 135,000

We are not aware of there being any extensive alienations in the Lower Provinces, if the Suttaish Hazaree Mehal, which forms the endowment of the Jagannáth temple, be excepted.

* See Appendix, No. I.

We have taken great pains to ascertain, as far as possible, the probable amount of nett income or loss to Government, from the various shrines within the Presidency of Fort William, i. e. in the Lower and Western Provinces. The following is the result of our inquiries ; the statements give the average of twelve years, commencing with 1823-24 and ending with 1834-35.

From Jagannáth, the total collections amount to rupees 133,955 per annum. The expenses are rupees 164,288, causing a deficiency of rupees 30,333 a year.

At Gyah, the aggregate receipts are 231,377, the charges 39,138, profit 192,239.

At Allahabad, receipts about 80,000, expenses 12,000, surplus 68,000.

At Suheswan, receipts 650, charges 40, gain 610.

At Mirzapore, income about 500.

At Moradabad, from Hindu shrines 2,800, charges, *nothing*.

Ditto ; receipt from Muhammadan shrines, rupees 25.

For the service of the temple at Kamoykya in Assam, Government are at the yearly charge of about 200 rupees.

These statements shew evidently enough that a connexion between the Government and the Idolatry of India *does* subsist. They exhibit also the amount of its receipts and expenditure, its profit and loss. The actual annual receipts are Rs. 4,558,692 ; annual expenditure 4,183,093, leaving an annual profit of above two and a half lakhs of rupees*. The Bombay Presidency alone does not meet its own expenditure. The measures resorted to for collecting and the means of disbursing these sums will be discussed hereafter.

Viewing the connexion as a mere *monetary* transaction, the profit is unworthy the acceptance of such a body as the **HONORABLE** proprietors of East India Stock. The source whence it is derived is so impure, and the amount realized as profit so contemptibly small, as to form no fair remuneration for the odium that must ever attach to its reception, or for the meanness into which it drags honorable men, both in its collection and distribution. We think almost any ordinary body of merchants would yield up such a source of profit, for the good opinion of the community at large, especially if it were evident that the source of their disgraceful profit might be exchanged for one of honorable emo-

* The balance struck is about 3½ lakhs, but we believe the more correct statements make it but 2½. We have therefore stated that sum in preference.

lument. The number of East India Stock proprietors is, we believe, about 3,000. Now divide the two and a half lakhs among this body and what a mite does it yield to each individual ! It will give to each per annum 83 rupees, 5 annas, 4 pie ; per mensem scarcely 7 rupees ; per week 1 rupee, 12 annas ; per day 3 annas, 7 pie, 8 gundas, 2 cowries ; per hour half a pice ;—yes, every hour the proprietors of East India Stock are receiving from an idolatrous traffic the paltry sum of *half a pice each* !!!—not enough to buy their salt ! Amongst the number too, there are twenty-seven *clerical* holders of Stock, and pious laymen, females and others, who, we are confident, were it fully known to them, would not crown the brows of their guardians with an immortal laurel for such an addition to their incomes.

We are most anxious to eschew every thing which would involve us in political discussion on the subject : yet, as we have advocated the dissolution of the connexion and now urge it on monetary principles, it is but fair to point out what we may deem a probable means of replenishing an exhausted exchequer. We cannot dismiss the impression that, if increased facilities for colonization and for drawing forth the latent resources of this “land of milk and honey” were afforded—if the Government would but employ the number of agents *now* employed in the idolatrous service, for effecting such objects, and endeavour to introduce improvements in manufacture and agriculture—they would soon obtain a much larger and more honorable revenue than this, coupled with the happiness of seeing the people elevated instead of debased, and of making them more attached to their western rulers, by infusing into their minds and habits a taste for western science and literature, modes of trade and commerce. Let us suppose for instance, the Government should bend their attention to the one province of Arracan—a province in which they lose annually about one and a half lakhs of rupees. Arracan is become a proverb for disease and death—to send a man to Arracan is like sending him to his grave ; and what is the cause of its unhealthiness ? Its fecundity—it is a country rich in woods, minerals, rice, every thing capable of yielding immense interest for the investment of capital. Arracan is especially adapted for the manufacture of salt of the finest and most pungent quality ; it can be manufactured and brought to Calcutta at a much lower rate and of better quality than from almost any other station ; besides which, if the Government would establish one central spot for the manufacture of salt in Arracan, it would at once strike at the root of a system of smuggling which entails great misery on all connected with it, and robs the Government of a large revenue. We are

confident that if the Government would bend their attention to this province alone, not only would they save the amount now annually sunk in its support, but they would easily bring into their exchequer a large and honorable supply of gold and silver; and might add to this, too, the prevention of an illicit traffic and secure the daily increasing healthiness, from agricultural improvements, of one of the (at present) most unhealthy provinces in their possession. We have referred to what *might* be done in the *worst* province; how much more might be effected in the healthy ones!

We think that, on the principles of commerce, we have made out a case for the entire relinquishment of the justly reprobated connexion with idolatry,—on account both of the smallness of the advantage derived from it, and of the means which are at hand for filling up the blank in the exchequer which would be occasioned by its dissolution.

With ourselves such arguments have no influence in questions of moral obligation; they are addressed, not to Christian men or Christian principles, but to mere *bonâ fide* money-making merchants, the mere monetary advocates of the system. We shall hereafter touch on the civil, moral and religious bearing of this subject upon the character of the Company, the British nation, and the Church of Christ. Let us ask your attention in the second place to

The Illustrative and Confirmatory

part of this subject. We had intended to accompany the following statements explanatory or illustrative of the evils resulting from the Government connexion with Idolatry with a few corroborative remarks; but owing to the accumulating and astounding evidence pressing upon us from every quarter, we are convinced that the facts themselves will speak a language which no right-minded man can misunderstand; and as our object is calmly to inform and not unjustly to influence the public mind, and to communicate information as speedily and fairly as possible, we have preferred publishing the facts and letting them speak for themselves. It must not be supposed that the few facts recorded in this paper are either the whole that can be adduced, or that they are selected for their peculiar flagrancy—they have been gathered with impartiality from very many, and that because they are such as we believe can neither be qualified or denied.

1. In the Presidency of Bombay a Durgah, named Hazrat Shâh Mâsûm Ghatalpandû, was founded by a priest of that name in North Arcot in 1742. To this Durgah was assigned a village called Curua.

voor, granted as a *Muddadnash* by Nabob Wullaja. In 1832, the Government of Fort St. George, ordered the resumption of this village, the local Collector and the Board of Revenue having considered the title of the existing incumbent to be invalid and the village legally resumable. It was represented to Government that the Durgah in question was one held in considerable estimation, and much resorted to by the Muhammadan community; and that some allowance ought to be made from the exchequer for its maintenance. In compliance with this request the local Government allotted the sum of one rupee per diem for the expenses, which were stated to be for the following purposes:

Lamp Oil. Rice, &c. to the Faqeers daily,
Firewood to keep up a fire by day and night.
Rice, &c. for performing the Ooroon ceremony.
Ditto ditto, for the Sundal ceremony. For cloth for a flag.
For the Fauteyah ceremony of Buckreedh and Mohurram.

For Servants.

A superintendent of the Durgah. A Lamp-lighter.

A servant to prepare fire for the Hookah.

A cook. A Koran reader. A sweeper.

A servant to give water to the Faqeers who halt at the Durgah.

2. At Neermull turuf Aghossee, there is an allowance paid from the treasury of about Rs. 300 per annum for feeding Brahmins, providing cloth for the idols, and paying for musicians and illuminations.

3. In April 1835, a proposition came before the Bombay Government from the Dharwar district, that a sum of Rs. 719. 12. 7, saved from the offerings made to the Pagoda of Banshunkurree, and credited to Government, should be laid out in the construction of a car for the idol at that place. The proposition was however negatived.

4. The worshippers at the several religious institutions in Dharwar, offer, at the temples, money, jewels, and other ornaments such as earrings, noserings, armlets, &c. which offerings are received and appropriated to the purposes of Government.

5. In the public accounts of the temple of Wanshunkarree in Belgaum, a place of some note, the items of expenditure at one *jātrā* are thus stated:

Paid to Pūjāris (officiating priests), for their services.

Lamps for the temple.

Daily offerings to the idol. Entertainment to Brahmins.

Paid people employed to repeat the " Mantras " before the idol.

To singers. Repairing the car and the temple.

- Expense of parading the idol. Dress for the idol.

Bangles for ditto. Nautch girls. Cooks. Tinning pots.

6. In the year 1835, an elephant had been presented to the idol at Jeejoora in Poona, by the Scindia Râja. According to the usual practice of disposing of all such offerings for the benefit of Government, sanction was solicited for the sale of the animal, and for carrying the proceeds to the public credit. We have not heard of any orders on the subject having been passed ; the last account states that the animal had been sold, and the sale proceeds held in deposit by the Collector of the district.

An image called Mahadeo stands in a village (Neerwunjee) situated on the banks of the Meera, to which pilgrims on their journey to a shrine of greater celebrity situated on the hill-, generally present such trifling offerings as dates, betel-nuts, cowries, and a handful or so of grain, pulse, &c. The time for making these offerings lasts, during the month of Chait, for a period of nine days ; the proceeds collected within this time are divided between the Government and the headman and officers of the village, the former in the proportion of five, and the latter of four parts. Government however lately farmed out its share of the offerings, for one season, for a sum of 4 Rs. 5 *anas*!!!!

The Government not only farm out the offerings of certain temples, but in some cases they are the *farmers*. As an instance in point we might advert to the history of the temple of Shree Runchorejee in Kaira. Certain villages were granted in Enam in connexion with this temple to Gopal Jugoonaath Tumheykar of Sutarah, by the Guickwar and Peshwa governments in 1770. This man, after the erection of the temple, retired to his native country and left the management to a gomastah. On the discovery of certain mal-practices on the part of this gomastah, the Guickwar government undertook the management ; and when the territories came under our rule, the British Government volunteered its interference ; and having assigned an allowance of Rs. 100 per mensem to the founder, appropriated to itself the whole revenues, defraying from them at the same time the expenses. We are willing to admit that in this case the affairs of the temple are conducted through an agent appointed by the founder ; but why should not all Government interference and the

entire management be left with the principal and his agent? In addition to this unsolicited and unnecessary interference, we might add that the Government have made over to this *gomastah* the conduct of the Police duties of that locality.

We are glad to be able to state that the Bombay Government, since the late agitation of the question for dissolving its connexion with the native shrines, has actually withdrawn its interference from some of them. In the Dharwar district this withdrawal is in course of execution. The following sources of revenue have also been relinquished.—Offerings for religious ceremonies at the temple of Jeejoora, among which was a description of offering, presented by *barren women*, to the idol Khundobah.

A tax levied from devotees who, at *játrás*, perform the ceremony of Gul Tosena, a barbarity similar to the Churruck Pujá on this side of India.

Taxes from persons performing certain *obscene rites* at the *játrás* at the temple of the Yellama Deve Good, in Oogergole, in the Pursagar district.

2. *At Jagannáth*.—The following are the words of the law (Regulation IV. of 1809) on the subject of the management of the temple at Jagannáth, which we consider quite conclusive as to the real character and extent of the Government interference.

“II. *First*. The superintendence of the temple of Jagannáth and interior economy, the conduct and management of its affairs, and the control over the priests, officers, and servants attached to the temple, are hereby vested in the *rája* of Khoordah, who on all occasions shall be guided by the recorded rules and institutions of the temple, or by ancient and established usage.

“*Second*. The *rája* of Khoordah, and his successors shall hold the charge vested in them by the above clause, so long as they shall continue to conduct themselves with integrity, diligence, and propriety; but nothing contained in this regulation shall be construed to preclude the Governor General in Council, from removing the present *rája*, or any of his successors, from the superintendence of the temple, on proof of misconduct in such person, made to the satisfaction of Government.

“*Third*. To enable the superintendent of the temple to perform the duty of his station with efficiency, he is hereby authorized to punish persons subject to his control, for any instance of neglect or misconduct, by imposing small fines upon them, not exceeding one

month's salary or income, or by removing the offender (if not one of the three head purchas) from his office, if the offence shall appear to merit that punishment. The amount of any fines imposed under this clause, is to be carried to the account of Government by the Sattaishazzarry purcha.

" III. *First.* The three dewul purchas are to be appointed by the Collector of Cuttack, subject to the confirmation of Government, and they are not to be removed from their offices without the sanction of the Governor General in Council. These officers however are to execute the functions of their offices under the directions of the rája, and they are required to obey his orders punctually.

" *Second.* In the event however of any orders being issued by the rája, inconsistent with the recorded rules and institutions of the temple, or with its ancient and established usages, it shall be the duty of the purchas to represent the circumstances of the case to the Collector of the tax, for the final orders of the Governor General in Council, if it should appear on inquiry that the interposition of Government is necessary for the restoration of good order, and the prevention of disputes and irregularities.

" IV. The third dewul purcha shall execute the duty of Sattaishazzarry* purcha, and it shall also be his duty to give an account to the Collector of the tax, of all offerings and presents made to the idol.

" V. A tax shall be levied on the part of Government (as was heretofore done under the late Marhatta Government, and as has also been done under the British Government, since the conquest of the province of Cuttack) on pilgrims resorting to the temple of Jagannáth. The collection of the tax shall be entrusted to an officer with the official designation of the Collector of the tax on pilgrims. But that officer is to be subject to the authority of the Collector of Cuttack. The general superintendence of the collections, and the control of the officers employed in the performance of that duty, shall be vested in the Board of Revenue at Fort William."

The superintendence of the temple is vested in the rájá of Khoordah. But according to the present system, the rájá acts merely in an administrative capacity under the British authorities. The real management is vested in them: and the rájá is accountable to them for

* i. e. Superintendent of the Estate called Sattaishazaree which forms the endowment of the temple; but the mehal is now managed by a tahsildar (a Government officer) under the Collector. This mehal yields about 18,000 Rs. a year.

every thing he does. The accounts are audited by them ; the purchase of new idols and cars, and the sale of the old cars cannot be effected without their sanction. Again, the deputies to the rájá, called Dewul Purchas, are appointed by the Collector himself for the management of the internal economy of the temple, and they are directly responsible to him. Rules, it will be seen, are laid down for preventing any thing being done *inconsistent with the recorded rules and institutions of the temple or with the ancient and established usages* ; and an account is exacted of *all offerings, and presents made to the idols*.

In July 1836, about the time of the Ra'h Pújá, an emergent application was received from the Collector for authority to disburse the expenses necessary for certain repairs to the idol and for adorning it for exhibition ; a reply equally emergent was returned by the Right Honorable the Governor of Bengal, granting the amount solicited. We have had an opportunity of inspecting some of the accounts kept in the Collector's office ; and it was as amusing as it was painful to observe such items as "sale of damaged Ruth Cloths" and of "old Ruths" and "purchase of 435 yards of broad cloth for the Ruths."!!

The subject of withdrawing the patronage of the State from this idolatrous shrine, engaged the serious attention of Government in 1832. The Sudder Board of Revenue, we understand, had very creditably come forward with a firm and determined representation. Notwithstanding the opinion of the local officers* was strongly opposed to their views, they had the courage to advocate the abandonment of the Government interference, regarding that interference as a matter of deep regret and urging the adoption of their proposition as a course due to the character of the Government in the eyes of its native subjects.

We have been favored with a passage from Mr. Deputy Secretary Thomason's letter of the 4th September, 1832, written by order of the then Government, consisting of Sir Charles Metcalfe and the Hon'ble Mr. Blunt, the latter of whom was for some time Commissioner of the Cuttack province. This passage will put our readers in possession of the views and sentiments entertained by the then Supreme Authority.

* In a matter of *principle*, the opinion of those who have any pecuniary interest in a matter ought to be received with some reservation. The Collector draws a commission on the amount of revenue derived from the pilgrim tax !

"His Honor in Council feels pleasure in expressing his concurrence with the Board. He considers it highly desirable that the interference of the Government with the concerns of the temple should be withdrawn. He views the control over the affairs of the temple as tending to support the worship and increase the resort of pilgrims. He is not aware of any circumstances which render the continuance of such support necessary or expedient, and he is prepared to sanction any scheme which may be proposed having for its object the discontinuance of that support, and the relinquishment of the entire care and superintendence of the temple to the worshippers of the idol which it contains."

The matter, after some further agitation, remained in abeyance, until the receipt of the Hon'ble Court of Directors' letter of February, 1833, when the call first mentioned, was made upon all the subordinate governments to render their accounts to the Supreme Government.

An objection has been stated, viz., that if the tax were to be abolished, the temple could not be left to the support yielded by its own endowments, without the Government being guilty of a breach of faith; for by Section 30, Regulation XII. of 1805, the Government is bound to supply whatever deficiency may occur.

On reference to this law we are at a loss to discover any pledge of this kind. We give the words—

"XXX. The rules continued in Regulation XXIV. 1793, for deciding on the claims of persons to the continuance of pensions and allowances granted for religious purposes, shall be considered to be in force in the zillah of Cuttack, in common with other regulations extended to that zillah, by Section 36, of this regulation; provided however, that in cases in which persons have obtained pensions from the Government of Berar, under grants made previous to the 14th of October, 1803, such pensions shall be continued to the present incumbents, and will either descend to their heirs and successors, or will revert to Government on the decease of the present incumbents, as shall appear to the Governor General in Council, on a consideration of the tenor of the grant, and all the circumstances of the case, to be proper, under Section 4, Regulation XXIV. 1793; provided likewise, that in cases in which persons shall have been in the actual receipt of pensions, during a period of three or more years, antecedent to the 14th of October, 1803, under whatever authority, such pensions shall be continued to the present incumbents, during their respective lives, but shall revert to Government on the decease of the present incum-

bents, unless any particular reasons shall appear to the Governor General in Council to exist for continuing the said pensions to their heirs and successors. Provided also, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize the resumption of the established donation for the support of the temple of Jagannáth, the charitable donation to the officers of certain Hindoo temples called Anoochuttree, and the allowance granted for the support of the Hindoo temple at Cuttack, called Setaram Thakoor Barée."

The extent to which Government now, (at a clear loss,) contribute towards the expenses of the temple, as per statement noticed in a preceding page, is about Rs. 30,000 per annum. We conceive however, that the donation referred to in the law above cited, is no other than the estate which constitutes the endowment of the temple, and which cannot and need not be resumed; as, in all other cases, the Government do not intend to reclaim such grants, but to leave them in the hands of those interested in the fame and honor of the shrines with which they are connected. But, if the clause in question can be made to bear the construction of a promise of pecuniary, or rather ready-money donation, we deny that the obligation of granting any such donation is intimately connected with, or implied in, the continuance of the tax;—if the one be renounced, the other must cease. It is no violation of good faith to relieve one's self of a responsibility, when the person so desirous of relief ceases to draw the advantages in consideration of which that responsibility was undertaken*.

III. *At Allahabad.*—Having said thus much of Jagannáth, and as a great part of what has been said in relation to that shrine, is applicable to Gyah, we proceed to notice some particulars respecting the tax collected at Allahabad. The amount of revenue collected on the occasion of the annual melá held at the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumma, is rated at about Rs. 80,000 per annum. For a particular knowledge of the nature of this duty and the manner of its collection, we cannot do better than refer our readers to the provisions of Regulation XVIII. of 1810.

"A. D. 1810. REGULATION XVIII.

"A REGULATION for the Collection of the Duties on Pilgrims at Allahabad.—PASSED by the Governor General in Council, on the 16th October 1810: corresponding with the 1st Kartick 1217, Bengal era; the 4th Kartick 1218, Fussily; the 2nd Kartick, 1218, Willaity; the 4th Kartick 1867, Sumbut; and the 16th Ramsaan 1225, Higeree.

* See Appendix, No. IV.

"WHEREAS, it has been deemed expedient to establish specific rules for the better prevention of all abuses in the collection of the duties on pilgrims at Allahabad, the following rules have been enacted by the Governor General in Council, to be in force from their promulgation.

"II. *First.* The duties hitherto paid by pilgrims resorting to the conflux of the rivers Ganges and Jumna at Allahabad, shall continue to be levied at the following rates :

- "On every pilgrim on foot,..... One rupee.
- "On every pilgrim with a horse, or palankeen, or carriage of any description, Two ditto.
- "On every pilgrim with a camel,..... Three ditto.
- "On every pilgrim with an elephant, Twenty ditto.

"*Second.* All other duties, fees, or gratuities at the *ghaut*, within the fort, or at any other place, whether demanded in the name of Government or for the benefit of individuals, are hereby strictly prohibited.

"III. Every pilgrim, on application to the Collector of the land revenue at Allahabad, shall be furnished with a license *entitling* him to perform the usual religious ceremonies, and no person shall be admitted to the performance of such ceremonies until he shall have furnished himself with such license.

"IV. The exception from duty hitherto allowed to the inhabitants of the town of Allahabad and of its suburbs, and to the Hindoos in the Honorable Company's army, is hereby confirmed. But with a view to obviate the abuses to which this exemption is liable, every such person shall be furnished with a license, of exemption, or *manfee chittee*, on application to the Collector, and shall not be entitled to admission to the performance of the religious ceremonies until he shall have furnished himself with such *manfee chittee*.

"V. No duty or tax of any kind shall be imposed upon the shaving barbers, or *hajams*, attending at the conflux of the two rivers ; but they shall be required to register their names at the collector's office, and execute an obligation to the collector, binding themselves under a penalty of fifty rupees in every instance of contravention, not to perform that part of the ceremonies which rests with them to any person who shall not have furnished himself with the prescribed license or *manfee chittee*.

"VI. The access to the place of ablution at the conflux of the two rivers shall be restricted to a certain number of gates or avenues, to be

fixed upon in a barrier, which shall be annually established on the subsiding of the rivers, from the palisades of the fort of Allahabad to the bank of the river; and no person shall be admitted through such barrier except on the production of the prescribed license or *maafee chittee*.

" VII. Such numbers and descriptions of native officers as may be approved of by the Board of Commissioners, shall be stationed by the collector at the above mentioned barrier, whose duty it should be not to admit within the barrier any person except on the production of the prescribed license or *maafee chittee*.

" VIII. In addition to the aforesaid officers, a sufficient military force, in the discretion of the officer commanding the station at Allahabad, shall on application of the collector, be posted at the said barrier during the *mela* or principal concourse of pilgrims in the months of January and February. And it shall be the duty of the military employed on the occasion, to prevent the concourse of people from breaking through the barrier, or otherwise forcing admission.

" IX. The licenses and *maafee chittees*, after being shewn at the place of admission, shall be delivered up to the officers who may be appointed to receive them and shall be returned to the collector in order to their being cancelled.

" X. All persons, who, with a view to avoid payment of the duty, shall, instead of presenting themselves at the established places of admission, attempt to cross over in boats from the opposite side of the river to the place of ablution, shall on the fact being proved to the satisfaction of the collector, be liable to a fine of three times the prescribed duty; and if any *hujam* shall assist any such person in the performance of the ceremonies, such *hujam* shall be liable to the penalty stipulated in his engagements.

" XI. No *hujams*, except such as shall have entered into the obligation prescribed by Section 5, shall be permitted to officiate in the ceremonies of the pilgrims; and any *hujam*, who without having entered into such obligation, shall be proved to the satisfaction of the magistrate to have contravened this prohibition, shall be liable to the penalty of fifty rupees for every pilgrim whom he shall be proved to have shaved, and in the event of his not being able to pay the penalty, shall be committed for three months to the *dewanny* jail."

Under the former Governments, the duties were sometimes farmed. The rates demanded varied as pilgrims came on foot, horseback, camels or elephants: according, in short, to the rank of the worshipper or the

distance whence he came. There was however one feature of humanity in respect to the persons from whom these collections were made by former Governments which is not continued by ours, viz. that pilgrims who had nothing to pay, or who were, to all appearance, destitute, were exempted from the impost. The British Government, in order to prevent abuses, excuses none; it lays down the rates by law, payable by parties travelling on foot, or in vehicles, or on beasts. It has however specially exempted the barbers who serve at the ceremony of the tonsure, which is an indispensable preliminary to the ablution; and this because, by their means, the Government hope to prevent any evasion, of the prescribed tax. The barbers are required to register their names and to shave no pilgrim who does not produce what is termed a *māfi chittā* or license; and they are bound by a penalty of 50 Rs. for every instance of discovered breach of their covenant. None but licensed barbers are permitted to serve on these occasions. A friend of ours who was present at the *meld* held in January of 1836, describes the concourse as immense, and the practices horrible. Curiosity led him into the Collector's Cutcherry, whence he purchased one of these *māfi chittās* from a devotee, of which the following is a faithful copy. The purport of the three dialects is the same.

“ ۴۱۳۴۱ ”

“ Tax Licence, One Rupee Sicca for the admission of One Jattree Teerut Prague. (Jātrī tīrtha prayāg.) ”

“ محصول چٹھی یک روپیہ سکہ برای رفتن یک نفر جاتری
و تیرتھہ ہر اگ ”

“ महसुस चोटि वक बयचा सिक्का वसति जावे वक चादनी कास
रीति य परच वके ”

“ تحریر ۲۲ جنوری سنہ ۱۲۳۸ عیسوی ”



We need only remark that it requires but an hour's observation at the Collector's office, on one of these occasions, to satisfy one's self as to the minute connexion of the Government officers with the ceremonies in question. The pilgrims in general are in a state of wretchedness from their journeying and abstinence; and the rush to obtain licences

is such as to need walls and barriers to prevent accidents and death by pressure ; and well indeed may the anxiety of the pilgrims be great, for, according to the local tenet, no one is at liberty to taste food until after the ceremony of bathing shall have been performed !

There are certain expenses defrayed by the Government on those occasions, such as the setting up of a " Nobud-khana" and the performance of the " Banee Poojah."

Before concluding, we would offer a remark or two on a report which has reached us ; viz. that it is the intention of Government to give up all connexion with the great shrines of Hinduism, excepting the interference which is exercised for the collection of the local cesses. We cannot for a moment suppose that such a measure is in serious contemplation. Without adverting to higher considerations, it would be opposed to the ordinary principles of justice and humanity. To abstain from exercising control and yet to desire the profits, to collect a tax and yet to refuse security and protection to the contributors, is unjust and argues a cupidity as mean as it is unjust. Should we continue a local impost when all local disbursements had ceased ? Should we exact any payment while we left the payers to the merciless exactions of priests, of police-men, and the myrmidons of the zamíndárs ? Let the charge of oppression abide with those by whom it is exercised ; let the temple and the shrine suffer the desertion, which they merit by the countenance of such oppression ; but let not the British Government share in the iniquity by receiving the gain ; let it not eventually have to rue its love of money, under the reproach which it will have earned, added to the loss of revenue which will assuredly follow the withdrawal of its present protection. But we regard the interference of Government and the levying of the tax to be inseparable, they must abide or cease together. We have already said that we think the Government does not violate its faith by refusing its support where it renounces the profits ; and we may add, that it *incurs a legal and moral responsibility to contribute to the protection and comfort of those from whose contributions it derives a large revenue.*

Who is there in perusing such statements but must blush for his country ! Who but must cease to wonder that the natives will not respect a faith the professors of which make that which its founder himself declares to be the root of all evil, the main object of their government to acquire, and who most deliberately cast in the whole weight of their influence and power to support a system of religion the most debasing and immoral on the face of the earth, and that for gold ! ! The

evil must and will if not abandoned, like all other unhalloved traffics, work its own ruin and involve its abettors in irretrievable disgrace.

We would now ask your serious reflections on

The Moral and Religious

bearing of the whole question.

The Government appears determined to continue its disgraceful connexion with the idolatry of the country, while the religious and humane portion of the community at home and many persons abroad appear to be equally resolved on its dissolution. The parties have fully and fairly entered the arena, and those who feel an interest in the elevation and happiness of the human race must watch the progress and issue of the contest with the most intense anxiety. The inequality of the combatants in the estimation of a superficial observer might at once decide that the palm must be ceded to the ruling powers, but the battle is not always to the apparently strong, nor the race to the swift. The possession of power does not always ensure success—no not *even* in ordinary concerns, much more when the object for which we contend is inseparably connected with the morality and salvation of *mankind*. There is a God that ruleth in the earth; and he is a jealous God, neither will he give his glory to another, nor allow his servants to transfer it to the gods of the heathen. We do, without laying any peculiar claim to foresight, safely predict what the termination of this conflict will be. The Government must be defeated if it will not yield. The data on which our assurance rests is the page of history, confirmed by the experience of every day. It is true of nations, as of individuals, that 'though a sinner do evil an hundred times and escape with impunity, yet shall punishment eventually overtake him.' Our own convictions are, and we state them without hesitation or reserve, that if the Government of India or any other government will deliberately and perseveringly maintain such a connexion as that which now subsists, with the warning and entreaties of the servants of God sounding in their ears, that sooner or later they will be punished and a similar fate will overtake them to that which overtook the Egyptians for their oppression of the church, and which fell upon the Israelites for their abandonment of God and admixture of his truth with the errors of the surrounding idolaters.

Entertaining such views, and having brought forward painfully satisfactory evidence of the union which subsists between the British Government of India and the idolatry of the country, it now devolves

upon us in defence of our conduct to show* that that union involves the sacrifice of moral principle; is an act of cruelty to the natives; infringes the rights of conscience of some of the best servants of the Government, and is one of the foulest blots on our divine and blessed faith. It is ~~the~~ spot in our feasts of charity. We have assumed, and we think rightly, in this pamphlet, that the Government of India is *bonâ fide* a *Christian Government*, and that as such it should be influenced alone by Christian motives. Nothing advanced by our opponents has for a moment induced a different estimate either of the character or the duty of the Government—not but that we are quite open to conviction on this point, for we would much rather it were clearly demonstrated that the Government was any thing but Christian, so long as it adopts a line of policy so opposed to Christian truth. But if it is not Christian, what is it? Is it Musalmán? No.—Hindu? No. It is like the image of prophecy—a union of clay, iron, wood, gold, and every naturally unadhesive substance, and awaits a similar fate. The present Government of India is, we reiterate, a Christian Government: it is composed of Christian men—men who in all the relations of life (save this) are professedly governed by Christian principles, and who would consider it the greatest insult you could offer them to suppose they would by a public act, adopt a line of conduct that would be a positive suicide of every thing virtuous and upright in moral character. Men who as fathers, husbands, brothers, and private Christians are governed by the principles of the gospel, but who as rulers legislate for the continuance of that which imprints a lie on their own faith, and degrades the character of God. Strange anomaly! The legislator puts off the Christian at the door of the council chamber and puts on the—we have no expression capable of conveying the idea of the character which he assumes. Those who compose the council of Government are Christian men, held under Christian principles in every place but that council. All the confidential subordinates of Government are Christian men. Every day and hour are they such save when they ascend the judgment-seat or enter the council chamber: except when they think or legislate for the millions committed to their charge. This position has been denied, but not disproved: there is one position however undeniable—the *Government of India is composed of Christian men*. This is the character of the parent Government, the character which this local one assumes at home, and it is the character which it assumes to the natives whatever may be thought to the contra-

ry. What would be thought in Britain should it be fairly stated that the end for which the British Government in India existed was to uphold and perpetuate the religions of Muhammad and Brahma? What a burst of righteous indignation would fall on the rulers of India. Yet this is the professed principle and practice of this Government, nor will all the caution which they can manifest in theory, while they have such a practice, prove to the natives that the Government has any but two principal objects in view—the *amassing of money and the ultimate propagation of Christianity*—two objects than which none can be more dissimilar; but two which are inseparably connected in the native mind. If it is not, why are natives so sensitive as it respects all the religious movements of Government? And if they have formed this estimate, in what a contemptible light must our native fellow subjects view their rulers—rulers who are ashamed to avow even their *desire* that the religion on which their own hopes rest for salvation, and which they believe to be the only true religion on earth,—ashamed even to avow their desire that the light of this religion should enter the heart or cheer the path of their poor Hindu or Musalmán subjects. One of the best illustrations of Native feeling in reference to religious matters with which we have become acquainted is, that of a father who when solicited to send his boy to a Government School, in substance answered “No, I will not entrust the education of my son to the hands of men who profess a religion they are ashamed to teach, and who teach only those religions they declare to be a lie; either they are designing men or they have a bad faith. I would not do so.”

Should either the former or the latter position be denied, we have still this stronghold to which we can continually resort; the Government of India are a body of men *representing a Christian people*, a people before whom they would tremble to acknowledge they had acted in other than a Christian manner and for Christian purposes in this heathen land. We should rather like to see that servant of Government who would be willing to meet an assembly of Englishmen (not the scandalized meetings of Exeter Hall), and unblushingly and in his undisguised mother-tongue avow that he had acted upon the principle of this Government. We believe such a declaration would not meet with a response from the most latitudinarian whig mob. Every man would be ashamed of a Government which had so far forgotten its character and that of the people it represented—a Government which, with the expression of liberality on its lips, excluded but one religion

from its schools and connexion, and that religion its own!!! Their cry would be, and justly, Be Hindu—Be Musalmán, but be decided, and do not by a vacillating course of conduct rob your country of that which is its chief pride—its decision; or of that which is the chief source of its elevation and happiness—its religion. But the Government of India represents a much higher class, or rather we should say, misrepresents them. The religious and humane of our country. What would they say to hear from the lips of a civil or military servant, that he had by express command sanctioned the horrors of heathenism, and the blasphemies of the Musalmán faith; that he had stood and commanded his companions in arms to fire salutes at the festival of any god which the locality might choose to reverence. Would not the upright exclaim, “ Oh Lord, how long, how long shall those that are called by thy name sanction these blasphemies ? ” The Christians in Britain do not yet fully understand this subject; but when they do, we shall hear that calm but overwhelming expression of indignation rising against its abettors which has risen against and overwhelmed the oppressors of Africa's injured race.

The Government of India, as the representatives of the British people, are in one sense the *representatives of the one true God*; but how have they represented Him? or rather, what indignity do they not offer to him by the support they afford to perpetuate a system which strikes at the very basis of his throne and robs him of his glory? We are aware that this will be set down as madness and fanaticism, as uncharitable raving and assuming that judgment which belongs to God alone. To this we have but one reply—we write the words of soberness and truth—words which derive all their force from the results of daily experience and the testimony of history. The God we serve, and whom this Government dishonors and insults, is the same that broke the power of the Babylonish sovereign, and who has driven, into scattered exile his own people, because the one and the other forgot his claims and depised his authority. Not only does the Government of India represent a free and enlightened people but it contains in its own body many who feel the burden of their office; many who feel they have engaged in a profession which, they but too late discover, demands a sacrifice of every feeling valued by man and a Christian*. What a position is this in which a professedly Christian Government has placed its most upright servants that they shall

* See Appendix, No. V.

not dare to open their lips to instruct an erring mortal in the way of life, and that they must not dare, except under the fear of the displeasure of their honorable masters, publicly to sanction the missionary teachers of their own faith. What shall we think of a Government that will exact as a pledge from one of its chief ecclesiastical functionaries that he shall not move in this or any similar subject? and make this the *sine qua non* of his appointment? What shall we say of a Government who could censure one of the holiest and best men that ever trod the shores of India for calmly representing for himself and colleagues the conscientious scruples which they entertained on this subject? and who could designate such calm and respectful remonstrances as attempts to *goad* the Government into acquiescence, and further attempt to silence the voice even of petition by a threat that the evils we deplore shall just be perpetuated in proportion to the vigour of our efforts to suppress or modify them? What shall we think of the *neutrality* of a Government who will designate its public servants, who in their private movements would teach the Natives the fear and love of God, "Missionary collectors" and "proselyting zealots," and represent them in the discharge of a conscientious duty to God, as attempting to sow the seeds of dissension and disaffection towards the British Government? What shall we say of such conduct, indulged in by such a Government, to such servants? What! but that it is subversive of every principle of civil and religious liberty, and that it is as arbitrary as the most conclusive ukase that ever issued from the most absolute despot! It is the most direct infringement of that which is the unalienable birth-right of every man, liberty of conscience and speech; yet such is the course of conduct pursued by the British Government towards its upright and religious servants. The injustice and anti-neutrality of the conduct is increased by the course of conduct pursued towards other religionists. A Musalmán may attempt the conversion of a Hindú or vice versa, nothing is opposed; or an infidel may unsettle the faith of both, and be unmolested; and should these transfers take place, every civil protection is afforded the subject—but how different is it should the Christian open his lips and succeed in conversion,—he is silenced and his converts become the victims of both civil and religious injustice. Where every thing evil is to be apprehended from the transition, nothing is provided; but where nothing but good is anticipated, the whole influence of a despotic Government is called in to aid the many in oppressing the few, and that not because they the Government

esteem the oppressors right, but because they are the many. The majority of the human race roam in a state of nudity—will the councillors of India recommend that? Why not, they are the many? A Musalmán or a Hindu has only to complain how obnoxious it is for him to assist at the religious festival of the opposing sect and he is relieved, but let the oppression of the Christian be ever so heavy, or let his objections spring from ever so enlightened a conscience, he may complain but in vain for relief, and have insult added to this refusal. We are not in the habit of invoking any save the good Spirit of our God, yet we cannot but help exclaiming, “ Oh Spirit of Liberty, Neutrality and Justice, how many and afflictive are the curses inflicted on mankind in thy name. Descend, vindicate thine own cause, and be justified in all thy children !”

The course of conduct is unjust and cruel to the Natives. It should be the design of every wise and paternal Government to enlighten and bless its subjects, and we know that whatever evils the ambition and wickedness of men may have attached to Christianity, that wherever it has exerted its influence—there

The prisoner leaps to loose his chains ;
The weary find a hopeful rest,
And all the sons of want are blest.

This we do know whether we are really or nominally Christians, that wherever Christianity has been diffused amongst a people, there every degrading practice has been exchanged for that which could chasten, elevate and bless. In the face of this knowledge, a knowledge without which no man is fitted for a legislator, and not even fitted for it if possessed, if he is not prepared to carry it into practice—in the face of this we shut out from this people that which has blessed others and which *alone* can bless them : and if we set out our own profession, we shall shut them up for ever in that ignorance and barbarity in which they have been immured for ages. Christianity is the only thing which can permanently help these people, and as far as the Government is concerned it is withheld from them ; not this only, but they are taught by the Government to love and venerate every abomination, and to descend to hell with a lie in their hand, a lie confirmed and sanctioned by the acts of a pseudo liberal, Hindu, Musalmán, Christian, Government. Oh what will such a Government have to answer for in the presence of that God who will demand as well from rulers as people, “ Give an account of your

stewardship." Oh what a host of accusing witnesses will arise from their bed of sorrow in that day and say, "The Christian rulers of India possessed the lamp of life, but they hid it from us; they knew the way to heaven but they hedged it up with thorns; *their* charity clothed our system with a sanction it would otherwise never have possessed, and hence they cheated our souls! Hindu rulers proselyted our forefathers to a hideous faith; Musalmán conquerors imposed on us a furious creed; but Christians, with the possession of the knowledge of the true God and his son Jesus Christ, allowed us for fear of offending our prejudices to live miserably and die damned." If one of those rulers (especially if they be pious) should read this tract, would that it might lead them to imagine they hear the voice of the great multitude irretrievably lost, accusing them of treachery to Christ, and to weigh their policy in the balance of truth and the light and revelations of that day, and then pur sue, if they can for one moment, a line of conduct so fraught with present evil and future wretchedness to the millions of India. Yes, we do, in the name of our insulted and dishonored Master, call on all those who sincerely love and serve Him at least to remonstrate against, if not to wash their hands of, such a system; for, if there can be any thing calculated to mar the peace of their last and otherwise tranquil moments; if there be any thing which could make the crown of life sit uneasy on their redeemed brows, it would be the share they have taken in, and the sanction they have given to, the connexion of the British Government with the idolatry of India. The reasons offered by the Government for the continuance of the connexion may be reduced to the following, their *professedly religious neutrality*:—*fear of exciting the prejudices and hatred of the natives* by any interference with their religious feelings or practices, and the *inopportuneness* of the present time for conceding the requests of the friends of religion. These have been the long assigned reasons of the Court expressed by their public servants in language which has recently been adopted as their own. One of these authorities, Sir Thomas Munro, says, referring to native prejudice and the fear he entertained from any interference by the servants of Government in religious matters,—

"It never was intended to employ Collectors and Magistrates as teachers of morality and religion. We cannot allow any public officer to act as a Missionary merely because he supposes that he abstains from obnoxious interference. Every man has a different opinion regarding the obnoxious limits, and each would fix them differently according to the standard of his own zeal.

"It is the declared intention both of the Legislature and of the honorable the Court of Directors, that the people of India should be permitted to enjoy their ancient laws and institutions, and should be protected against all interference of public officers with their religion. This system is the wisest that could be adopted, whether with regard to the tranquillity of the country, the security of the revenue, or the improvement or conversion of the Natives."

"In every country, says Sir Thomas Munro, but especially in this where the Rulers are so few and of a different race from the people, it is the most dangerous of all things to tamper with religious feelings. They may be apparently dormant, and when we are in unsuspecting security they may burst forth in the most tremendous manner as at Vellore. They may be set in motion by the slightest casual incident, and do more mischief in one year than all the labors of Missionary Collectors would repair in a hundred. Should they produce only a partial disturbance, which is quickly put down, even in this case the evil would be lasting; distrust would be raised between the people, and the Government, which would never entirely subside; and the district in which it happened, would never be so safe as before."

Our impression on perusing this opinion was that of surprise—surprise that so shrewd a man should have involved the rights of conscience in religious matters, with the faithful discharge of political duties, and that he should have so far mistaken the nature of religious efforts as to designate them 'obnoxious interference'; nor were we less surprized that he should have mistaken the simple request for the cessation of all Government interference, and supposed that it meant that the Government should invade either the ancient civil or religious rights of the natives. In reference to the first it is clear that every man has a duty which he owes to God, which must be discharged let his situation or employment be what it may. The situation and conduct of Daniel in the court of Babylon is an apt illustration to the point; and in reference to the second it may be reiterated, as it has been again and again, that no Missionary, no advocate of the dissolution ever wished the Government to *interfere with the religion*, much less with the ancient laws and institutions of the country. The simple request has been *to let it alone, not to interfere, not to sanction the creed of any sect*, and especially not to sanction the creed of one at the expense of another, not to make the one a prisoner that the other should walk free. The very sentiment that every man has a different opinion regarding obnoxious limits, shows the absolute necessity of a real neutrality on the part not only of this but of every Government:

but we may ask—for we are not now combating with the dead but the living, (for they have adopted not only the sentiment but the very language of the dead)—we may ask, have the Court of Directors never violated their neutrality as it regards the laws and institutions of the country? What are the land resumption measures, but a direct inroad on the sacred lands (and we think perfectly right); but do they not bear on a subject much more likely to move a native to daring deeds, than any other? do they not affect his purse? What is the conveyance of native troops by sea but a direct infringement of one of the fundamental laws of Hinduism? and at what a cost was it obtained! We enumerate these and might refer to other similar acts, to show that the Government are not over-scrupulous about interference when territory or revenue are at issue, but only when religion is in question: we might do this, but space forbids. We must also express our astonishment that so enlightened a body as the Court of Directors should have adopted an extract which has revived the calumny of the Vellore insurrection; and especially as here implying, and more than implying, what has been completely refuted, that Christianity was the origin of that, as it would be of other acts of an insurrectionary character. Whereas it is well known that it originated in a furious quarrel between the two dominant sects, for insults either real or supposed offered by one party to the other; and if Christianity is to be propagated in such a spirit or be the parent of such fruits, we shall be amongst the first to adopt as our own these now antiquated and long exploded sentiments; but since the gospel has always been and must ever be successfully propagated by peaceful and unirritating means, we must enter our protest against a conclusion as unjust as the premises are incorrect. We simply ask when has there been an instance in which an insurrection happened in India from a Missionary source; rather has not Missionary influence been called in more than once to suppress troubles which political or commercial cupidity had excited but could not suppress? We affirm without the fear of contradiction that Indian Missions have in no one instance given rise to insurrection or bloodshed, and therefore the fears based on the Vellore case are groundless and should not be the basis of either a prohibitive or penal enactment. We are equally surprised that a mind so discriminating as Mr. Thackeray's should have given expression to the following confused notions on which the present resistance also rests:—

“Our success in India is in a great measure owing to our religious neutrality; the failure of other European nations, especially of the

Portuguese in maintaining their power, was owing to their injudicious attempts to convert the Natives to their own religion. As we could not have established, so we cannot maintain our empire without continuing this neutrality*. It would have been much better that we should have failed in establishing, than that we now should shake to pieces on our own heads, the great edifice of power now erected, by such imprudence."

We are surprised that he did not, or could not discriminate between the bloody, lustful, tyrannical conquests of the Portuguese and the peaceful efforts of modern Protestant Missionaries. The former by every act inciting the people to thoughts and deeds of rebellion, the latter only conferring on those amongst whom they laboured the blessing of civilization and peace. Besides it may be again asked, Do the Government adhere to their neutral policy in matters most sacred? Did they not take the funds of the Hugli Emámhára and apply them, we think, to a good purpose, but certainly one wide of the object to which the donor designed they should ever be applied? Did they not take a Musalmán fund to educate the youth of all creeds in western science, the science of infidel dogs? Have they not recently taken unto themselves the funds of a certain Hindu temple in Bengal? Have they not done as much as the Missionaries to uproot the ancient laws and institutions of the country by the establishment of schools, colleges, &c. in which sciences are taught directly at variance with the whole structure of the faith of the people?—schools which deprive the pupils of the miserable comforts of Hinduism and leave them without even an inanimate god? The Government find them the devotees of Káli and leave them the votaries of brandy-páni and roast-beef. We have here a Government who on the one hand declares it cannot dissolve an unholy alliance, for fear of losing the confidence of the people; and on the other issuing mandates for the resumption of sacred lands and the teaching of sciences most directly tending to estrange the affections and sap the faith of these very people. We do not blame the Government for these measures; far from it, we think they are just in the highest degree, if under Christian direction; but, as at present conducted, an un-mixed evil. Having adverted to these sentiments at length we can but slightly notice the objection as to the *inopportuneness* of the present time for acceding to our request. This is an old excuse and may be best answered by the inquiry, when is the right time for those in authority to concede the request of the petitioning if it involve

* QUERR.—This begs the whole question—We deny it.—COMPILER'S.

pecuniary or patronial considerations? We have never heard of the time, nor shall we until it is created by the pressure from without. We have but simply to refer to a report which declares, that the Government are now endeavouring to ascertain the exact amount of the *direct patronage* which they afford to the idolatry of India by grants of money made, since the accession of the British power, and when they have ascertained the exact amount of such expenditure they will probably be most willing to concede the point. The amount of such expenditure is a mere fraction, and if granted would be but a mockery of our prayer; it would leave the main question untouched: a quibbling compliance like this would be as unworthy the Government as it would be unsatisfactory to us. We know of no other argument or excuse that can be urged in support or extenuation of the practice, save that in our own country we have mixed up with our festivities and religious holidays, many remnants of druidical and other practices to which it is thought the Hindu idolatries bear some resemblance, the rudeness and cruelty of which have been removed by the process of education and general improvement; we are not opposed to any such remnants of superstition, they may be good monitors; but we ask, would they have been what they are if the Government of Britain had upheld them, paid their priests, and provided their sacrifices? No; instead of the jocund laugh and the merry dance at our Hallowe'ens and other similar feasts, we should have had the victims of Wodin and his companions reeking at our doors. We want the Government of India to act in this matter as did the ruling powers of Britain, and then are we sure that all the abominations of idolatry will cease, and the Holi, and Durgá, and Charakh be times, if continued, of mere festival and relaxation. It may be further urged that should there be any of the festivals of the Hindus in which the Government could sympathize with the people and take part without the sacrifice of Christian principle they should most gladly comply. If there was such a festival, we should say, by all means; but if it be true that a Christian cannot attend a common nách without leaving an impression on the minds of the audience that he has done homage to the Penates, how much more deeply must the impression be on the mind of a Native that the Government as such are offering sacrifice to the whole heathen pantheon! It may be only the gift of a decorated cocoa-nut, or the purchase of a flag for a masjid; but it is in the eyes of an ignorant community equal to the more costly and splendid donations of an actual Hindu or Musalmán.

We have now laid before you the pecuniary, political and moral bearing of this question as far as our limited space will allow. Before taking leave of you it may be as well to put you in remembrance of the present position of the question. The Court of Directors appear determined to do nothing unless they are compelled. Their last resolution, passed on the presentation of several petitions on the subject, is one which appears to have been passed in a spirit of determined resistance and defiance. They say—

“ We now desire that no customary salutes or marks of respect to Native Festivals be discontinued at any of the Presidencies, that no protection hitherto given be withdrawn, and that no change whatever be made in any matter relating to the Native religion, except under the authority of the Supreme Government.”

We would impress on the minds of all those who wish success to this effort, that all that has been done as yet is the obtaining of authentic information and bringing the authorities to an actual decision ; for although that decision be unfavorable to us it is nevertheless better than vacillation. We have now to make use of our information in a judicious and persevering spirit and to try and reverse this decision—a decision, as dishonorable to the Government as it is disgraceful to enlightened and religious Britain*.

We earnestly entreat your prayers. Oh ! send them up to the King of kings that He may dispose the hearts of our rulers ‘ to do justice and love mercy ;’ and we further entreat your active aid to accomplish, under *His* direction, a peaceful and rational triumph over error in its most wicked and unhappy form, so that ‘ both those who sow and they who reap may rejoice together.’ Amen.

Yours sincerely,

The Friends of Religion and Humanity.

Please Circulate this Tract amongst your friends.

APPENDIX.

This pamphlet has extended so much beyond the limits originally prescribed to us, that we are obliged to omit several letters and documents connected with the subject, and have been compelled simply to confine the Appendix, to a brief remark or two of an explanatory, and we hope, cheering character. The circumstances to which reference is made in the appendix have chiefly occurred since the papers from which the pamphlet was compiled were penned.

No. I.

Page 6.—We have much pleasure in presenting our readers with two examples worthy of imitation in this matter. Sir Peregrine Maitland, the Commander-in-chief of the Madras Army, has resigned his appointment, rather than enforce the orders of the Court in reference to the attendance of Christian soldiers at native festivals. R. Nelson, Esq. of the Madras Civil Service, has also resigned, rather than perform duties inconsistent with his profession as a Christian. Since the remonstrance of these two “worthies of the Indian Church” referred to above, the members of the Sudder Board of Revenue have presented a remonstrance to the Supreme Government, praying that they may be exempted from all interference with the erection of a Musalmán college at Hughli. The burden of their prayer is we believe the spirit of our own; viz. to “let the dead bury their dead;” to let the Musalmán and Hindu superintend the erection and management of their own shrines. May the prayer be heard, and the example imitated throughout India! Calm and respectful remonstrances and protests will do more to effect our object than violent declamation.

Page 12.—The returns made up since this pamphlet was penned, show a net gain to Government of above three lakhs of rupees from the three presidencies.

No. II.

This evil is not so much felt in the Bengal as in the Madras and Bombay presidencies, nor is it equally felt in all parts of these sections of the country. It is principally felt where the people are most debased and idolatrous, and hence is it the more to be deprecated and shunned. It should be our effort to raise the miserable natives to our standard, and not to sink them to their lowest level.

No. III.

Page 7.—We do not profess to be versed in laws either political or ecclesiastical, but it does appear a law of reason and common sense and justice to a people, to transfer, to a better purpose, funds left for

purposes which, at the time they were bequeathed, the donor believed to be good, but which after times prove to be highly detrimental to the advancement of the people. This was the case at the reformation in England; and if it is not in India, then must the money left for Hindu purposes be devoted to perpetuate the errors both scientific and religious of that system long after it shall cease to exist. We are not arguing for the adoption of any such measures, but, only wish to show that the difficulty may be and has been overcome.

Page 9.—The Government had raised the expectations of the British people by the celebrated despatch of Lord Glenelg. At that time both the foreign and home Governments appeared disposed to accede to the prayer of the abolitionists; but when the pecuniary returns referred in note I. exhibited such a large profit, all the former objections revived and influenced the Court to the present decision. One of the directors went so far as to attribute a host of imaginary wickednesses to the Missionaries, but could not be induced to propose their expulsion, which, to be consistent with himself, he ought to have done.

No. IV.

Page 10.—We understand that the Government are at this time discussing a plan for dissolving their connexion with Jagannath; this is a step towards the dissolution of the union throughout India which we hail with pleasure.

Page 22.—The proposed law under discussion, will of course settle all these minor points.

No. V.

Page 10.—It was our intention to have published this celebrated despatch, but the pamphlet having already so far exceeded the limits prescribed, we must beg the reader's indulgence for its omission. It is characterized by humanity, enlarged views of civil and religious liberty, and statesman-like and christian politics.

Page 30.—See Mr. Nelson and Sir P. Maitland's cases, and the Sudder Board's remonstrance.

No. VI.

Explanation of the Sentiments and wishes of the Abolitionists.

The sentiments and wishes of the advocates for the abolition of the Government connexion with idolatry having been more than once either misunderstood or misrepresented, we think it but right to state that all we desire and ask is that the Government will let the idolaters alone; will let them manage the matters connected with their religious services themselves. Thus much we ask as far as the natives are concerned; but we solicit for our fellow Christians that they may be exempted from being obliged to attend the abominable orgies of the heathen in an official capacity. We ask from a Christian Government noninterference with the heathen; and for their Christian servants LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

